

# A PROCEDURE FOR COMPUTING THE LOG CANONICAL THRESHOLD OF A BINOMIAL IDEAL

R. BLANCO AND S. ENCINAS

ABSTRACT. We present a procedure for computing the log-canonical threshold of an arbitrary ideal generated by binomials and monomials.

The computation of the log canonical threshold is reduced to the problem of computing the minimum of a function, which is defined in terms of the generators of the ideal. The minimum of this function is attained at some ray of a fan which only depends on the exponents of the monomials appearing in the generators of the ideal.

## INTRODUCTION

The multiplier ideal of an ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$  can be defined from the analytic or algebraic point of view, see for example [BL04] or [Laz10]. In this paper we use the algebraic approach which involves resolution of singularities.

Fix a log-resolution  $\Pi : Y \rightarrow X$  of an ideal  $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_X$  over a field of characteristic zero, the *multiplier ideal* of  $\mathfrak{a}$  is  $\mathcal{J}(\mathfrak{a}) = \Pi_* \mathcal{O}_Y(K_{Y/X} - F)$  where  $K_{Y/X}$  is the relative canonical divisor, and the divisor  $F$  defines the total transform of the ideal,  $\mathfrak{a} \cdot \mathcal{O}_Y = \mathcal{O}_Y(-F)$ . This definition can be extended for any real number  $t \geq 0$ , then we can attach to the ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$  a collection of *multiplier ideals*  $\mathcal{J}(t \cdot \mathfrak{a}) = \mathcal{J}(\mathfrak{a}^t)$ . These ideals and the invariants arising from them have been widely studied. See [BL04] for an introduction and [ELSV04] for some applications.

One of the main invariants defined in terms of multiplier ideals is the log canonical threshold. The log canonical threshold of the ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$  is the smallest number  $t > 0$  making the ideal  $\mathcal{J}(\mathfrak{a}^t)$  non trivial, and it is a measure of the singularities of the functions  $f \in \mathfrak{a}$ . Computing multiplier ideals and log canonical thresholds from their definition is difficult in general. In the case of monomial ideals, Howald [How01] proved that it is possible to compute the multiplier ideal and the log canonical threshold using the Newton polyhedron associated to the ideal. For binomial ideals, some cases are known. Shibuta and Takagi [ST09] gave a procedure based in linear programming to compute the log canonical threshold of complete intersection binomial ideals and the defining ideals of monomial curves in 3-dimensional space. See also [Tho14] where a formula for multiplier ideals of monomial curves in 3-dimensional space is presented.

We say that an ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$  is a general binomial ideal if  $\mathfrak{a}$  may be generated by monomials and binomials (2.10). We prove in theorem 4.10 that a log-resolution of  $\mathfrak{a}$  is non necessary to compute the log canonical threshold of  $\mathfrak{a}$ . It is enough to achieve what we have called a *pseudo-resolution* (3.5), where the total transforms of the generators of the ideal are products of monomials and binomial hyperbolic equations. The key point is that, after a pseudo-resolution, computation of the log canonical threshold reduces to two simple cases addressed in lemmas 4.8 and 4.9. Weak pseudo resolutions (3.3) are close to the toric desingularization morphisms defined in [GPT02], see also [Tei04, Section 6].

---

The authors were partially supported by MTM2012-35849.

Theorem 4.18 shows that computation of the log canonical threshold of  $\mathfrak{a}$  is reduced to the problem of computing the minimum of a function  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}$  (4.13), defined in terms of the generators of the ideal. The function  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}$  is defined for every  $v \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$  and it is not continuous in general, however proposition 4.16 shows that there exist a fan  $\Gamma$  with support  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$  and such that the function  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}$  is continuous in the relative interior of every cone of  $\Gamma$ . The minimum of  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}$ , and hence the log canonical threshold of  $\mathfrak{a}$ , is attained at some ray of the fan  $\Gamma$ , see proposition 4.19.

Our results generalize the procedure presented in [ST09] and lets to calculate the log canonical threshold for arbitrary binomial ideals, including the non complete intersection case. Shibuta-Takagi procedure relies on a linear programming problem formulated only in terms of the exponents of the monomials appearing in the generators of the ideal. We illustrate in example 5.6 that the log canonical threshold also depends on the coefficients of the binomials generating the ideal.

We also show, corollary 3.14, a constructive procedure to obtain a pseudo-resolution of a general binomial ideal. This procedure is based on Zeillinger's idea [Zei06] for solving Hironaka's polyhedra game. Using this idea only centers of codimension two are used for blowing-up. We use the same invariants as in [Gow05] where the author obtains a log-resolution for monomial ideals.

We include in section 5 several examples to illustrate our method. All computations were made with Singular [DGPS12].

## 1. LOG-RESOLUTION

In what follows  $k$  is a field of characteristic zero. We denote  $W$  to be a smooth algebraic variety over  $k$  and we recall definitions of log-resolution, multiplier ideal and log canonical threshold.

**Definition 1.1.** Let  $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathcal{O}_W$  be a non zero sheaf of ideals on  $W$ . A *log-resolution* of  $\mathfrak{a}$  is a proper birational morphism  $\Pi : W' \rightarrow W$  such that

- $W'$  is smooth over  $k$ ,
- the total transform of the ideal  $\mathfrak{a} \mathcal{O}_{W'} = \mathcal{O}_{W'}(-F)$  is an invertible sheaf associated to a normal crossing divisor  $F$  in  $W'$ ,
- and  $\text{Exc}(\Pi) \cup \text{Supp}(F)$  is a simple normal crossing divisor, where  $\text{Exc}(\Pi)$  is the exceptional locus of  $\Pi$ .

It is well known that if the field  $k$  has characteristic zero, then log-resolution of ideals exists. In fact they are procedures to obtain the morphism  $\Pi$  as a constructive sequence of blowing ups

$$(W, E) = (W^{(0)}, E^{(0)}) \leftarrow (W^{(1)}, E^{(1)}) \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow (W^{(N)}, E^{(N)}).$$

See [EV00], [BEV05] for details or [Hau03] for an extended review.

**Definition 1.2.** Let  $t \geq 0$  be a real number. The multiplier ideal of  $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathcal{O}_W$  with exponent  $t$  is:

$$\mathcal{J}(W, \mathfrak{a}^t) = \Pi_* \mathcal{O}_{W'}(K_{W'/W} - \lfloor tF \rfloor),$$

where  $\Pi : W' \rightarrow W$  is a log-resolution of  $\mathfrak{a}$  and  $\mathfrak{a} \mathcal{O}_{W'} = \mathcal{O}_{W'}(-F)$ .

If  $\Delta$  is a Cartier divisor in  $W$ , we also define the multiplier ideal associated to the ideal and the divisor:

$$\mathcal{J}(W, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}^t) = \Pi_* \mathcal{O}_{W'}(K_{W'/W} - \Pi^* \Delta - \lfloor tF \rfloor),$$

where here  $\Pi : W' \rightarrow W$  is a log-resolution of  $\mathfrak{a}$  with the additional condition that the divisor  $F + \Pi^*\Delta$  has normal crossings.

The definition of the multiplier ideal  $\mathcal{J}(W, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}^t)$  is independent of the choice of the log-resolution and it could be generalized when  $\Delta$  is a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor and even to the case  $W$  non-smooth, see [Laz04].

Note that the multiplier ideals  $\{\mathcal{J}(W, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}^t) \mid t \geq 0\}$  are a filtration,  $\mathcal{J}(W, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}^{t_1}) \supseteq \mathcal{J}(W, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}^{t_2})$  for  $t_1 \leq t_2$ . The first real number where the multiplier ideal is non trivial is called the log canonical threshold.

**Definition 1.3.** The log canonical threshold of an ideal  $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathcal{O}_W$  is

$$\text{lct}(W, \mathfrak{a}) = \inf\{t \mid \mathcal{J}(W, \mathfrak{a}^t) \neq \mathcal{O}_W\}.$$

If  $\Delta$  is a Cartier divisor in  $W$  then

$$\text{lct}(W, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}) = \inf\{t \mid \mathcal{J}(W, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}^t) \neq \mathcal{O}_W\}.$$

The definition may be local at a point  $\xi \in W$ ,

$$\text{lct}(W, \Delta, \mathfrak{a})_\xi = \inf\{t \mid \mathcal{J}(W, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}^t) \neq \mathcal{O}_{W, \xi}\}.$$

The log canonical threshold is a rational number, see [Laz04].

**Proposition 1.4.** Let  $\Pi : W' \rightarrow W$  be a proper birational morphism where  $W'$  and  $W$  are smooth varieties over  $k$ . Let  $U'_1 \cup \dots \cup U'_r = W'$  be an open cover in  $W'$ . Let  $\Delta$  be a Cartier divisor in  $W$ . If  $\Delta' = \Pi^*\Delta - K_{W'/W}$  then

$$\text{lct}(W, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}) = \min\{\text{lct}(U'_i, \Delta', \mathfrak{a}^*) \mid i = 1, \dots, r\}.$$

*Proof.* It follows from definition 1.3 and the fact that  $\mathcal{J}(W, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}) = \Pi_*\mathcal{J}(W', \Delta', \mathfrak{a}^*)$ .  $\square$

Note that the morphism  $\Pi$  in 1.4 need not to be a log-resolution of  $\mathfrak{a}$ . We will apply this result for  $\Pi$  a pseudo resolution (3.5) of a general binomial ideal.

## 2. TORIC VARIETIES

We remind here some basic notions about toric varieties, for more details see [CLS11] [Ful93] or [Oda88]. See also [GPT14] for generalization to non necessarily normal toric varieties.

Fix  $N \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$  a  $n$ -dimensional lattice and let  $\mathcal{M} = \text{Hom}(N, \mathbb{Z})$  be its dual lattice. Denote by  $N_{\mathbb{R}}$  the real vector space spanned by  $N$ .

**Definition 2.1.** A cone  $\sigma$  in  $N_{\mathbb{R}}$  is a *strongly convex rational polyhedral cone*, that is a set of non negative linear combinations of some vectors  $v_1, \dots, v_r \in N$  such that it contains no nonzero  $\mathbb{R}$ -subspace of  $N_{\mathbb{R}}$ .

A *face* of a cone  $\sigma$  is a subset  $\tau \subset \sigma$  such that there exists  $w \in \mathcal{M}$  with

$$\tau = \sigma \cap w^\perp = \{u \in \sigma \mid \langle w, u \rangle = 0\}.$$

One dimensional faces are called the rays of  $\sigma$  and we denote  $\sigma(1)$  the set of all rays of  $\sigma$ . Note that if  $\rho \in \sigma(1)$  then there exist a unique primitive vector  $v_\rho \in N$  generating the semi-group  $\rho \cap N$ .

A *fan*  $\Sigma$  in  $N$  is a set of strongly convex rational polyhedral cones  $\sigma$  in  $N_{\mathbb{R}}$  such that every face of a cone  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  is also a cone in  $\Sigma$  and the intersection of two cones in  $\Sigma$  is a face of each one of them.

Given a fan  $\Sigma$  in  $N$ , the *support* of  $\Sigma$ ,  $|\Sigma|$ , is the union of all the cones in  $\Sigma$ , that is, the set  $|\Sigma| = \cup_{\sigma \in \Sigma} \sigma \subset N_{\mathbb{R}}$ . We denote  $\Sigma(1)$  the set of all rays in  $\Sigma$ . By abuse of notation we will also denote  $\sigma(1)$ , resp.  $\Sigma(1)$ , the set of primitive vectors  $v_\rho$  with  $\rho \in \sigma(1)$ , resp.  $\rho \in \Sigma(1)$ .

If  $\sigma$  is a cone in  $N$ , the *dual cone*  $\sigma^\vee \subset \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}$  is the set of vectors in  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}$  that are nonnegative on  $\sigma$ , that is

$$\sigma^\vee = \{w \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}} \mid \langle w, u \rangle \geq 0 \ \forall u \in \sigma\}.$$

**2.2.** The semi-group  $\sigma^\vee \cap \mathcal{M} = \{w \in \mathcal{M} \mid \langle w, u \rangle \geq 0 \ \forall u \in \sigma\}$  is finitely generated. Hence the algebra of the semi-group  $k[\sigma^\vee \cap \mathcal{M}]$  is a finitely generated  $k$ -algebra that defines an affine toric variety  $U_\sigma = \text{Spec}(k[\sigma^\vee \cap \mathcal{M}])$ . In fact every affine normal toric variety is of this form.

Given a fan  $\Sigma$  in  $N$  we associate a (normal) toric variety  $W_\Sigma$  obtained by gluing the affine toric varieties  $\{U_\sigma \mid \sigma \in \Sigma\}$ , see [CLS11] for details.

**2.3.** We say that a cone  $\sigma$  is regular if the primitive vectors  $\sigma(1)$  are part of a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis of the lattice  $N$ . A fan  $\Sigma$  is regular if every cone  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  is regular. It is known that the toric variety  $W_\Sigma$  is regular if and only if the associated fan  $\Sigma$  is regular.

If  $\sigma$  is a regular cone, there exist a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis of  $N$ , say  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  such that  $\sigma(1) = \{v_1, \dots, v_r\}$  for some  $r \leq n$ . Let  $w_1, \dots, w_n$  be the dual basis in  $M$ , then the dual cone  $\sigma^\vee$  is generated by  $w_1, \dots, w_r, \pm w_{r+1}, \dots, \pm w_n$ . The associated affine toric variety is  $U_\sigma = \text{Spec}(k[x_1, \dots, x_r, x_{r+1}^\pm, \dots, x_n^\pm])$ .

**Remark 2.4.** Let  $\Sigma$  be a fan and  $\Sigma(1) = \{v_1, \dots, v_{m'}\} \subset N$  be the set of primitive vectors generating the rays of  $\Sigma$ .

Set  $N' = \langle \Sigma(1) \rangle \cap N$ . Recall that the toric variety  $W_\Sigma$  has a torus factor if and only if  $N'_\mathbb{R} \neq N_\mathbb{R}$  ([CLS11, 3.3.9]). The quotient  $N/N'$  is torsion-free and there exists a complement  $N'' \subset N$  such that  $N = N' \oplus N''$ .

Note that every cone  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  is generated by a subset of  $\Sigma(1) = \{v_1, \dots, v_{m'}\}$ ,  $\sigma(1) = \{v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_r}\}$  for some indexes  $i_1, \dots, i_r$ .

We associate to a fan  $\Sigma$ , and indeed to the toric variety  $W_\Sigma$ , a set of vertices  $\Xi \subset N$ .

$$\Xi = \{v_1, \dots, v_{m'}, v_{m'+1}, \dots, v_m\},$$

where  $\{v_{m'+1}, \dots, v_m\}$  is a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis of the complement  $N''$ .

Note that for every cone  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  there are vertices  $v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_n} \in \Xi$  such that:

- $v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_n}$  is a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis of  $N$ ,
- $\sigma(1) = \{v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_r}\}$  for some  $r \leq n$ .

Note that  $\Xi$  is not unique since there are many choices for the vertices  $v_{m'+1}, \dots, v_m$  as possible  $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis of  $N''$ . These additional vertices are needed in order to define globally monomials and binomials in a smooth toric variety, see 2.9.

Recall that the ring  $k[v_1, \dots, v_m]$  is the total coordinate ring of  $W_\Sigma$ . This ring has a grading given by the divisor class group  $\text{Cl}(W_\Sigma)$ . Two monomials  $v^a$  and  $v^b$  have the same degree if  $a - b$  satisfies the same linear dependencies as the  $v$ 's: If  $\sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i v_i = 0$  then  $\sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i (a_i - b_i) = 0$ . See [CLS11, §5.2].

**Definition 2.5.** [CLS11, Def. 3.3.13] Let  $\Sigma$  be a fan in  $N$ . A fan  $\Sigma'$  is a *subdivision* of the fan  $\Sigma$  if both fans have the same support and if every cone  $\sigma' \in \Sigma'$  is contained in a cone  $\sigma \in \Sigma$ .

Let  $\sigma$  be a regular cone generated by  $v_1, \dots, v_r$  and set  $\Sigma$  the minimum fan containing  $\sigma$ . The cones in  $\Sigma$  are  $\sigma$  and all the faces of  $\sigma$ . Fix a face  $\tau$  of  $\sigma$ , and assume that  $\tau$  is generated by  $v_1, \dots, v_s$ ,  $s \leq r$ . The *star subdivision* of  $\Sigma$  with center a face  $\tau \in \Sigma$  is the fan  $\Sigma'$  containing the cones  $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_s$  and all their faces, where each cone  $\sigma_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, s$  is generated by

$$(2.5.1) \quad v_1, \dots, v_{i-1}, v_1 + \dots + v_s, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_s, v_{s+1}, \dots, v_r.$$

If  $\Sigma$  is a fan and  $\tau \in \Sigma$  is a cone, then the star subdivision of  $\Sigma$  with center  $\tau$  is the fan  $\Sigma'$  such that:

- If  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  and  $\tau$  is not a face of  $\sigma$  then  $\sigma \in \Sigma'$ .
- If  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  and  $\tau$  is a face of  $\sigma$  then  $\sigma_i \in \Sigma'$  for  $i = 1, \dots, s$ , where  $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_s$  are cones as in 2.5.1.

**2.6.** Recall that any subdivision  $\Sigma'$  of a fan  $\Sigma$  defines a proper birational morphism  $W_{\Sigma'} \rightarrow W_{\Sigma}$ .

If  $\Sigma$  is a regular fan (i.e.  $W_{\Sigma}$  is a regular toric variety) and  $\Sigma'$  is a star subdivision of  $\Sigma$ , then  $\Sigma'$  is also a regular fan.

Let  $\Sigma'$  be the star subdivision of  $\Sigma$  with center  $\tau$ . If  $\Xi = \{v_1, \dots, v_m\}$  is a set of vertices for  $\Sigma$  then a set of vertices  $\Xi'$  for  $\Sigma'$  is obtained by adding one element.

If  $\tau$  is generated by the vertices  $v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_r}$  of  $\Xi$  then  $\Xi' = \Xi \cup \{v_{i_1} + \dots + v_{i_r}\}$ .

**Definition 2.7.** Let  $W = W_{\Sigma}$  be a regular toric variety, defined by a regular fan  $\Sigma$ . The combinatorial blowing up with center a cone  $\tau \in \Sigma$  is the morphism

$$W' = W_{\Sigma'} \rightarrow W = W_{\Sigma}$$

defined by the star subdivision  $\Sigma'$  of  $\Sigma$  with center  $\tau$  (2.5).

**Remark 2.8.** Combinatorial blowing ups correspond to usual blowing ups with center defined by some variables.

Let  $\Pi : W_{\Sigma'} \rightarrow W_{\Sigma}$  be the combinatorial blow-up with center  $\tau \in \Sigma$ .

Fix a cone  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  such that  $\tau$  is a face of  $\sigma$ . Set  $v_1, \dots, v_r \in N$  be generators of  $\sigma$  such that  $v_1, \dots, v_s$ ,  $s \leq r$  are generators of  $\tau$ . The open set  $U_{\sigma} \subset W_{\Sigma}$  is, by 2.3,

$$U_{\sigma} \cong \text{Spec}(k[x_1, \dots, x_r, x_{r+1}^{\pm}, \dots, x_n^{\pm}]).$$

The cone  $\sigma$  is replaced in  $\Sigma'$  by the  $s$  cones  $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_s$ , notation as in 2.5. The restriction of the combinatorial blow-up  $\Pi$  to the open set  $U_{\sigma}$ ,

$$U_{\sigma_1} \cup \dots \cup U_{\sigma_s} \rightarrow U_{\sigma},$$

is the (usual) blowing-up of  $U_{\sigma}$  with center  $(x_1, \dots, x_s)$ .

Extend the generators of  $\sigma$  to  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis of  $N$  and denote  $w_1, \dots, w_n$  the dual basis. The cone  $\sigma^{\vee}$  is generated by  $w_1, \dots, w_r, \pm w_{r+1}, \dots, \pm w_n$ . It is easy to check that for  $i = 1, \dots, s$  the cone  $\sigma_i^{\vee}$  is generated by

$$w_1 - w_i, \dots, w_{i-1} - w_i, w_i, w_{i+1} - w_i, \dots, w_s - w_i, w_{s+1}, \dots, w_r, \pm w_{r+1}, \dots, \pm w_n$$

and

$$U_{\sigma_i} \cong \text{Spec} \left( \left[ \frac{x_1}{x_i}, \dots, \frac{x_{i-1}}{x_i}, x_i, \frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}, \dots, \frac{x_s}{x_i}, x_{s+1}, \dots, x_r, x_{r+1}^{\pm}, \dots, x_n^{\pm} \right] \right).$$

**Definition 2.9.** Let  $W = W_\Sigma$  be a smooth toric variety. Let  $\Xi = \{v_1, \dots, v_m\}$  be a set of vertices for  $\Sigma$ .

A monomial in  $W$  will be a monomial in the total coordinate ring (2.4). We will denote by  $v^a = v_1^{a_1} \cdots v_m^{a_m}$  where  $a = (a_1, \dots, a_m) \in \mathbb{Z}^m$  with non-negative entries for every one-dimensional cone which means:

- If  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  is a cone and  $\sigma(1) = \{v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_r}\} \subset \Xi$  then

$$a_{i_1} \geq 0, \dots, a_{i_r} \geq 0.$$

If  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  is the cone generated by  $v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_r}$  then the monomial  $v^a$  in the open set

$$U_\sigma \cong \text{Spec}(k[x_1, \dots, x_r, x_{r+1}^\pm, \dots, x_n^\pm])$$

is  $x_1^{a_{i_1}} \cdots x_n^{a_{i_n}}$ , where  $v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_r}, v_{i_{r+1}}, \dots, v_{i_n}$  is a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis of  $N$ . It follows that the monomial  $v^a$  defines a sheaf of ideals in  $\mathcal{O}_W$  which is locally monomial.

A binomial in  $W$  will be a homogeneous binomial in the total coordinate ring. We will denote  $v^a - uv^b$ , where  $u \in k^*$ ,  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ , such that

- $v^a$  and  $v^b$  are monomials, i.e. for every cone  $\sigma$ , with  $\sigma(1) = \{v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_r}\} \subset \Xi$  then

$$a_{i_j} \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad b_{i_j} \geq 0 \quad \text{for} \quad j = 1, \dots, r$$

- and if

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i v_i = 0 \quad \implies \quad \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i (a_i - b_i) = 0.$$

An irreducible binomial is a binomial as above of the form  $v^{\beta^+} - uv^{\beta^-}$ , where  $\beta \in \mathbb{Z}^m$  and for  $i = 1, \dots, m$

$$\beta_i^+ = \begin{cases} \beta_i & \text{if } \beta_i > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \beta_i \leq 0 \end{cases}, \quad \beta_i^- = \begin{cases} -\beta_i & \text{if } \beta_i < 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \beta_i \geq 0 \end{cases}.$$

See [CLS11, §5.3] for more details for sheaves on toric varieties. A binomial defines a hypersurface in  $W_\Sigma$  such that at every affine open set  $U_\sigma \subset W_\Sigma$  it is defined by a usual binomial.

**Definition 2.10.** A monomial ideal in  $W = W_\Sigma$  is the ideal sheaf in  $\mathcal{O}_W$  generated by a finite set of monomials  $v^{a_1}, \dots, v^{a_\ell}$ . At every open subset  $U_\sigma$ ,  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  corresponds to an ideal generated by monomials in a polynomial ring.

A general binomial ideal in  $W_\Sigma$  is the ideal sheaf generated by a finite set of monomials and binomials.

**Proposition 2.11.** *Every binomial  $v^a - uv^b$  may be expressed as a product of a monomial and an irreducible binomial*

$$v^a - uv^b = v^\alpha (v^{\beta^+} - uv^{\beta^-}).$$

*Proof.* Set  $\alpha_i = \min\{a_i, b_i\}$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , and  $\beta = a - b$ . Since  $v^a - uv^b$  is a binomial then it is easy to check that  $v^{\beta^+} - uv^{\beta^-}$  is also a binomial.  $\square$

## 3. PSEUDO-RESOLUTION

Combinatorial blowing up are enough to obtain the log-resolution of monomial ideals, but it is not possible to obtain log-resolution of binomial ideals only with this transformations. However we will prove that these combinatorial transformations are enough to obtain pseudo-resolutions which allow to compute the log canonical threshold.

In what follows  $\Sigma$  is always a regular fan and  $\Xi = \{v_1, \dots, v_m\}$  is a set of vertices of  $\Sigma$ .

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $\Sigma'$  be the star subdivision of  $\Sigma$  with center  $\sigma \in \Sigma$ , let  $\Xi = \{v_1, \dots, v_m\}$  be a set of vertices of  $\Sigma$  and  $\Xi' = \{v_1, \dots, v_m, v_{m+1}\}$  be a set of vertices of  $\Sigma'$ . Assume  $\sigma(1) = \{v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_r}\}$  are the vertices of  $\sigma$ .*

*If  $v^a = v_1^{a_1} \cdots v_m^{a_m}$  is a monomial in  $W_\Sigma$ , then the total transform of  $v^a$  is the monomial in  $W_{\Sigma'}$*

$$v_1^{a_1} \cdots v_m^{a_m} v_{m+1}^{a_{m+1}}, \quad a_{m+1} = a_{i_1} + \cdots + a_{i_r}.$$

*If  $f = v^{\beta^+} - uv^{\beta^-}$ , with  $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m) \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ , is an irreducible binomial in  $W_\Sigma$ , then the strict transform of  $f$  in  $W_{\Sigma'}$  is  $f' = v^{\beta'^+} - uv^{\beta'^-}$  where*

$$\beta' = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m, \beta_{m+1}), \quad \beta_{m+1} = \beta_{i_1} + \cdots + \beta_{i_r}.$$

*Proof.* It follows from 2.8 and 2.11. □

Note that if  $\mathfrak{a}$  is a monomial (resp. general binomial) ideal then after a combinatorial blowing up  $W' \rightarrow W$  then the total transform of  $\mathfrak{a}$  is again a monomial (resp. general binomial) ideal. In fact this is also true for any regular subdivision  $\Sigma'$  of  $\Sigma$ , even if  $\Sigma'$  is not obtained by a sequence of star subdivisions.

If  $a = (a_1, \dots, a_m) \in \mathbb{Z}^m$  and  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  is a cone with  $\sigma(1) = \{v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_r}\}$  then we denote  $a_\sigma = (a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_r}) \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ .

**Definition 3.2.** We say that an irreducible binomial  $f = v^{\beta^+} - uv^{\beta^-}$ , with  $\beta \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ , is a hyperbolic equation if for every cone  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  then either  $\beta_\sigma^+ = 0$  or  $\beta_\sigma^- = 0$ .

A binomial  $f = v^a - uv^b$  in  $W_\Sigma$  is said to be weakly resolved if  $f$  may be expressed as the product of a monomial and a hyperbolic equation. This means that if  $\beta = a - b$  then for every cone  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  either  $\beta_\sigma^+ = 0$  or  $\beta_\sigma^- = 0$ .

We will say that every monomial  $v^a$  is weakly resolved.

Let  $\Sigma'$  be a subdivision of  $\Sigma$  obtained by a sequence of star subdivisions, and let  $f$  be a binomial in  $W_\Sigma$ . Note that the morphism  $W_{\Sigma'} \rightarrow W_\Sigma$  is a log-resolution of the ideal generated by  $f$ , if and only if the total transform of  $f$  is weakly resolved.

For an ideal generated by more than one binomial the above result is not true, in this case one can obtain an embedded desingularization of the variety defined by the binomials, see [Tei04, Section 6].

**Definition 3.3.** Let  $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathcal{O}_W$  be a general binomial ideal generated by binomials and monomials  $f_1, \dots, f_r$ .

A weak-pseudo-resolution of  $\mathfrak{a}$  with respect to the generators  $f_1, \dots, f_r$  is a sequence of combinatorial blowing-ups  $W'_{\Sigma'} \rightarrow W_\Sigma$  such that the total transforms of generators  $f_1^*, \dots, f_r^*$  are weakly-resolved as in (3.2).

The above definition depends on the generators of the ideal. Note also that every monomial ideal is already weak-pseudo-resolved.

**Definition 3.4.** We denote the partial ordering  $\preceq$  in  $\mathbb{Z}^m$ , defined as follows: If  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}^m$  then  $\alpha \preceq \beta$  if and only if  $\alpha_i \leq \beta_i$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . Where  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m)$  and  $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m)$ .

It is the usual partial ordering given by division of monomials.

Using the above partial ordering we can refine a weak-pseudo-resolution to a pseudo-resolution.

**Definition 3.5.** Let  $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathcal{O}_W$  be a general binomial ideal generated by binomials and monomials  $f_1, \dots, f_r$ .

A pseudo-resolution of  $\mathfrak{a}$  with respect to generators  $f_1, \dots, f_r$  is a weak-pseudo-resolution  $W' \rightarrow W$  such that if  $f_1^*, \dots, f_r^*$  are the total transforms and for  $i = 1, \dots, r$

$$\begin{aligned} f_i^* &= v^{\alpha_i} (v^{\beta_i^+} - u_i v^{\beta_i^-}) \text{ if } f_i \text{ is a binomial, or} \\ f_i^* &= v^{\alpha_i} \text{ if } f_i \text{ is a monomial,} \end{aligned}$$

then for every cone  $\sigma \in \Sigma'$  the vectors  $(\alpha_1)_\sigma, \dots, (\alpha_r)_\sigma$  are totally ordered with respect to the ordering  $\preceq$ .

Note that in order to prove if a weak-pseudo-resolution is a pseudo-resolution it is enough to check the condition of totally ordered only for maximal cones of  $\Sigma'$ .

**Proposition 3.6.** *Let  $\mathfrak{a}$  be a general binomial ideal generated by  $f_1, \dots, f_r$ . There exists a pseudo-resolution of the ideal and it can be obtained by a sequence of star subdivisions of  $\Sigma$ .*

*Proof.* First one may produce log-resolutions of every generator  $f_i$  to obtain a weak-pseudo-resolution  $W' \rightarrow W$  of the ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$ . The total transforms  $f_1^*, \dots, f_r^*$  can be expressed as

$$f_i^* = v^{\alpha_i} (v^{\beta_i^+} - u_i v^{\beta_i^-}), \quad \text{or} \quad f_i^* = v^{\alpha_i},$$

where each  $v^{\beta_i^+} - u_i v^{\beta_i^-}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, r$  is a hyperbolic equation.

Now consider the monomial ideals generated by the pairs of binomials

$$\{v^{\alpha_i}, v^{\alpha_j}\}, \quad \forall i < j,$$

and construct a simultaneous log-resolution for all these monomial ideals, say  $W'' \rightarrow W'$ . Now it is easy to check that  $W'' \rightarrow W$  is a pseudo-resolution of the ideal generated by  $f_1, \dots, f_r$ .  $\square$

The proof of proposition 3.6 is based on the existence of log-resolution of monomial ideals. Now we define some invariants that will produce a constructive pseudo-resolution where every step is a combinatorial blowing up with a two codimensional center.

**Definition 3.7.** Fix a regular fan  $\Sigma$  in  $N$  and  $\Xi = \{v_1, \dots, v_m\}$  a set of vertices of  $\Sigma$ . We define the function  $L = L_\Sigma : \mathbb{Z}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ , for  $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m) \in \mathbb{Z}^m$  set

$$L(\beta) = \max\{|\beta_i - \beta_j|, \beta_i \beta_j < 0, \text{ and } \{v_i, v_j\} \text{ generate a 2-dimensional cone in } \Sigma\}.$$

If  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  is a cone then we set

$$L(\beta, \sigma) = \max\{|\beta_i - \beta_j|, \beta_i \beta_j < 0, \text{ and } \{v_i, v_j\} \text{ generate a 2-dimensional face of } \sigma\}.$$

If  $f = v^{\beta^+} - uv^{\beta^-}$  is an irreducible binomial in  $W_\Sigma$  then set  $L(f) = L(\beta)$ .

In general, if  $v^a$  and  $v^b$  are two monomials in  $W_\Sigma$  then we set  $L(\{v^a, v^b\}) = L(a - b)$ .

Note that  $L(\beta) = \max\{L(\beta, \sigma) \mid \sigma \in \Sigma\}$  and

$$L(\beta) = \max\{|\beta_i| + |\beta_j|, \beta_i\beta_j < 0, \text{ and } \{v_i, v_j\} \text{ generate a 2-dimensional cone in } \Sigma\}.$$

Function  $L(f)$  was introduced in [Zei06] in order to give a solution to Hironaka's polyhedra game. See also [Gow05] where the same invariant appears. The two-codimensional centers that will be allowed in our procedure will be those pairs appearing in the definition of the function  $L_\Sigma$ .

**Definition 3.8.** A 2-dimensional face  $\{v_i, v_j\}$  of  $\Sigma$  is permissible for an irreducible binomial  $f = v^{\beta^+} - uv^{\beta^-}$  iff  $\beta_i\beta_j < 0$ .

In general if  $v^a$  and  $v^b$  are two monomials then we say that  $\{v_i, v_j\}$  is permissible for the pair of monomials  $\{v^a, v^b\}$  if  $(a_i - b_i)(a_j - b_j) < 0$ .

**Proposition 3.9.** *Let  $f$  be an irreducible monomial in  $W_\Sigma$  and let  $\{v_i, v_j\}$  be a permissible 2-dimensional face of  $\Sigma$  for  $f$ . If  $\Sigma'$  is the star subdivision of  $\Sigma$  with center  $\{v_i, v_j\}$  and  $f'$  is the strict transform of  $f$ , then  $L_{\Sigma'}(f') \leq L_\Sigma(f)$ .*

*Proof.* Note that  $\Xi' = \Xi \cup \{v_i + v_j\}$ . If  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  is a cone such that  $\{v_i, v_j\} \not\subset \sigma(1)$  then  $\sigma \in \Sigma'$  and  $L(f', \sigma) = L(f, \sigma)$ .

If  $\{v_i, v_j\} \subset \sigma(1)$  then  $\sigma$  is replaced in  $\Sigma'$  by two cones, say  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$ , where  $\{v_i, v_i + v_j\} \subset \sigma_1(1)$  and  $\{v_j, v_i + v_j\} \subset \sigma_2(1)$ . Since  $\beta_i\beta_j < 0$  then  $|\beta_i + \beta_j| < \max\{|\beta_i|, |\beta_j|\}$  and it follows that

$$\max\{L(f', \sigma_1), L(f', \sigma_2)\} \leq L(f, \sigma).$$

□

**Definition 3.10.** If  $f$  is an irreducible binomial we define the pair of positive integers  $(L(f), Lp(f))$ , where  $Lp(f)$  is the number of pairs  $i < j$  such that  $L(f) = |\beta_i - \beta_j|$ .

**Proposition 3.11.** *In the situation of proposition 3.9, if the pair  $\{v_i, v_j\}$  is such that  $L(f) = |\beta_i - \beta_j|$  then*

$$(L(f'), Lp(f')) < (L(f), Lp(f))$$

*for the lexicographic ordering.*

*Proof.* It follows from the proof of 3.9. □

**Theorem 3.12.** *Given an irreducible binomial  $f = v^{\beta^+} - uv^{\beta^-}$ , the log-resolution of the ideal generated by  $f$  may be obtained by 2-codimensional blowups.*

*Proof.* It follows from 3.11. □

**Proposition 3.13.** *If  $\{v^a, v^b\}$  is a monomial ideal generated by two monomials, then the value  $(L(a - b), Lp(a - b))$  may also be used to obtain a log-resolution of the ideal.*

**Corollary 3.14.** *For a general binomial ideal, we may obtain a pseudo resolution given by a sequence of two-codimensional blowing ups constructed with function  $(L, Lp)$ .*

#### 4. COMPUTING LCT WITH A PSEUDO-RESOLUTION

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$  points in  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ . The Newton polyhedron of  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$  is the convex hull in  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$  of the set

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^m (\alpha_i + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n).$$

**4.2.** Note that a point  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$  is in the Newton polyhedron of  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$  if and only if

$$\beta \cdot v \geq \min\{\alpha_1 \cdot v, \dots, \alpha_m \cdot v\} \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n.$$

**Lemma 4.3.** [How01] *Let  $U$  be a smooth affine variety of dimension  $n$ . Let  $z_1, \dots, z_n$  be global sections in  $\mathcal{O}_U$  such that they are uniformizing parameters of  $U$ , which means that  $dz_1, \dots, dz_n$  is a basis of  $\Omega_{U/k}$ .*

*Let  $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathcal{O}_U$  be a monomial ideal in  $U$  w.r.t  $z$ 's. The ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$  is generated by monomials*

$$z^{\gamma_i}, i = 1, \dots, r.$$

*Let  $\Delta$  be a divisor defined by a monomial  $z^c$ ,  $\langle z^c \rangle = \mathcal{O}_U(-\Delta)$ . We assume that if  $z_j$  is a unit at every point in  $U$  then the previous monomials do not depend on  $z_j$ .*

*Then the multiplier ideal of  $\mathfrak{a}$  is*

$$\mathcal{J}(U, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}^t) = \langle z^\lambda \mid \lambda + c + \mathbf{1} \in \text{Interior}(tP) \rangle$$

*where  $P$  is the Newton polyhedron 4.1 of  $\gamma_i$ 's in  $\mathbb{N}^n$  and  $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)$ .*

*In particular the lct is  $\frac{1}{m}$  where  $m$  is the minimum number such that  $m(c + \mathbf{1}) \in P$ .*

*Proof.* It is an easy generalization of Howald's formula [How01], see [Bli04] for more precise statement.  $\square$

As a direct consequence of 4.2 we have the following result.

**Lemma 4.4.** *In the situation of Lemma 4.3, the lct of the monomial ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$  is*

$$\text{lct}(U, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}) = \min \left\{ \frac{(c + \mathbf{1}) \cdot v}{\min\{\gamma_1 \cdot v, \dots, \gamma_q \cdot v\}} \right\}.$$

The minimum in lemma 4.4 may be computed using linear programming, see [ST09, Prop. 1.3].

Hyperbolic equations will play a key role when computing the log-canonical-threshold of binomial ideals. These ideals have been characterized in [ES96, Th. 2.1]. We want to describe the behavior of such ideals when adding a new generator.

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ . Consider the hyperbolic binomials*

$$1 - u_1 x^{\beta_1}, \dots, 1 - u_r x^{\beta_r} \in k[x_1, \dots, x_n],$$

*where  $u_i \in k^*$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, r$ .*

*Let  $\mathfrak{a}_r$  be the ideal generated by  $1 - u_1 x^{\beta_1}, \dots, 1 - u_r x^{\beta_r}$  in  $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ .*

*Set  $y_i = 1 - u_i x^{\beta_i}$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, r$ , and let  $U = \text{Spec}(k[x_1, \dots, x_n]_h)$  where  $h = x^{\beta_1 + \dots + \beta_r}$ .*

*Assume that  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_r$  are  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent and set*

$$\varphi : \langle \beta_1, \dots, \beta_r \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow k^*$$

*to be the homomorphism from the lattice generated by  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_r$  to the multiplicative group  $k^*$  defined by  $\varphi(\beta_i) = u_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, r$ .*

- (1)  $y_1, \dots, y_r$  is part of a set of uniformizing parameters in  $U$ ,
- (2) Let  $\beta_{r+1} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$  be a vector with non negative entries and  $u_{r+1} \in k^*$ . The hyperbolic binomial  $1 - u_{r+1} x^{\beta_{r+1}}$  is in the ideal  $\mathfrak{a}_r$  if and only if

$$\beta_{r+1} \in \langle \beta_1, \dots, \beta_r \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}} \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi(\beta_{r+1}) = u_{r+1}.$$

- (3) Let  $\beta_{r+1} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$  be a vector such that  $\beta_{r+1} \in \langle \beta_1, \dots, \beta_r \rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}$ . Let  $u_{r+1} \in k^*$  and set  $\mathfrak{a}_{r+1}$  to be the ideal generated by  $1 - u_1 x^{\beta_1}, \dots, 1 - u_r x^{\beta_r}, 1 - u_{r+1} x^{\beta_{r+1}}$ . There are two open sets  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  in  $U$  such that
- (a)  $U_1 \cup U_2 = U$ ,
  - (b)  $\mathfrak{a}_{r+1} \mathcal{O}_{U_1} = \mathfrak{a}_r \mathcal{O}_{U_1}$  and
  - (c)  $\mathfrak{a}_{r+1} \mathcal{O}_{U_2} = \mathcal{O}_{U_2}$ .

*Proof.* (1) and (2) are proved in [ES96, Th. 2.1], nevertheless for (1) one can check it directly. The log-jacobian matrix of  $y_1, \dots, y_r$  is

$$\left( x_j \frac{\partial y_i}{\partial x_j} \right)_{i,j} = \begin{pmatrix} \beta_{1,1} u_1 x^{\beta_1} & \cdots & \beta_{1,n} u_1 x^{\beta_1} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \beta_{r,1} u_r x^{\beta_r} & \cdots & \beta_{r,n} u_r x^{\beta_r} \end{pmatrix},$$

and this matrix has rank  $r$  in  $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]_h$  if and only if  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_r$  are linearly independent.

Now we prove (3). By the assumptions, there exist a positive integer  $q$  and integers  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r$  such that

$$q\beta_{r+1} = \lambda_1 \beta_1 + \cdots + \lambda_r \beta_r.$$

If  $u_{r+1}^q \neq \varphi(q\beta_{r+1})$  then  $\mathfrak{a}_{r+1} \mathcal{O}_U = \mathcal{O}_U$  and we may set  $U_2 = U$ ,  $U_1 = \emptyset$ .

Assume that  $u_{r+1}^q = \varphi(q\beta_{r+1})$ , by (1) we have that  $1 - u_{r+1}^q x^{q\beta_{r+1}} \in \mathfrak{a}_r$ . Set

$$g = \frac{1 - u_{r+1}^q x^{q\beta_{r+1}}}{1 - u_{r+1} x^{\beta_{r+1}}} \in k[x_1, \dots, x_n] \quad \text{and note that} \quad (g, 1 - u_{r+1} x^{\beta_{r+1}}) = 1.$$

Set  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  the open sets of  $U$  given by localization at  $g$  and  $1 - u_{r+1} x^{\beta_{r+1}}$  respectively and we obtain the result.  $\square$

Note that in the proof of 4.5, only (1) needs that the field  $k$  has to be of characteristic zero. The result is also true for  $k$  of characteristic  $p > 0$ , if we assume that  $\bar{\beta}_1, \dots, \bar{\beta}_r$  are  $\mathbb{F}_p$ -linear independent.

**Lemma 4.6.** Let  $r \leq n$  and let  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$  be such that

$$\alpha_1 \preceq \alpha_2 \preceq \cdots \preceq \alpha_r.$$

Consider  $\mathbb{R}^{n+r}$  with coordinates  $(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_r)$  and the points

$$\begin{aligned} P_1 &= (\alpha_1, 1, 0, \dots, 0), \\ P_2 &= (\alpha_2, 0, 1, \dots, 0), \\ &\vdots \\ P_r &= (\alpha_r, 0, 0, \dots, 1). \end{aligned}$$

Then the Newton polyhedron of  $P_1, \dots, P_r$ , say  $\mathcal{P}$ , is defined in  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{n+r}$  by the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}
& x_i \geq \alpha_{1,i} \\
& x_i + (\alpha_{2,i} - \alpha_{1,i})y_1 \geq \alpha_{2,i} \\
& x_i + (\alpha_{3,i} - \alpha_{1,i})y_1 + (\alpha_{3,i} - \alpha_{2,i})y_2 \geq \alpha_{3,i} \\
& \dots\dots\dots \\
& x_i + (\alpha_{j,i} - \alpha_{1,i})y_1 + \dots + (\alpha_{j,i} - \alpha_{j-1,i})y_{j-1} \geq \alpha_{j,i} \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \\
& \dots\dots\dots \\
& x_i + (\alpha_{r,i} - \alpha_{1,i})y_1 + \dots + (\alpha_{r,i} - \alpha_{r-1,i})y_{r-1} \geq \alpha_{r,i} \\
& y_1 + y_2 + \dots + y_r \geq 1
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We call coordinate subspaces of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+r}$  to the linear subspaces defined by some coordinates equal to zero.

Since  $r \leq n$ , inequalities defining the Newton polyhedron  $\mathcal{P}$  are obtained by collecting the inequalities of the projections of  $\mathcal{P}$  to coordinate subspaces of dimension  $r$ . To be more precise, the set of inequalities defining  $\mathcal{P}$  is the union of the sets of inequalities defining  $p(\mathcal{P})$  where  $p : \mathbb{R}^{n+r} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^r$  is a linear projection defined by sending  $n$  coordinates to zero.

Let denote  $e_1, \dots, e_n, v_1, \dots, v_r \in \mathbb{R}^{n+r}$  the vectors of the canonical base. If  $p(e_1) = \dots = p(e_n) = 0$  then  $p(\mathcal{P})$  is the Newton polyhedron of  $(1, 0, \dots, 0), \dots, (0, \dots, 0, 1)$  defined by  $y_1 + \dots + y_r \geq 1$ .

Assume that some  $v_i$  is sent to zero,  $p(v_i) = 0$ . Let  $j_0$  be the minimum index such that  $p(v_{j_0}) = 0$ . Note that  $p(P_{j_0}) = (\alpha_{j_0}, 0, \dots, 0)$ . For  $i > j_0$ , it follows from  $\alpha_{j_0} \preceq \alpha_i$  that  $p(P_i) \in p(P_{j_0}) + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^r$ . The polyhedron  $p(\mathcal{P})$  is the Newton polyhedron of  $p(P_1), \dots, p(P_{j_0})$ . Projecting  $v_{j_0+1}, \dots, v_r$  to zero and all but  $e_i$  to zero we have the hyperplane

$$x_i + (\alpha_{j_0,i} - \alpha_{1,i})y_1 + \dots + (\alpha_{j_0,i} - \alpha_{j_0-1,i})y_{j_0-1} = \alpha_{j_0,i}.$$

We conclude that  $p(\mathcal{P})$  is defined by the inequalities

$$x_i + (\alpha_{j_0,i} - \alpha_{1,i})y_1 + \dots + (\alpha_{j_0,i} - \alpha_{j_0-1,i})y_{j_0-1} \geq \alpha_{j_0,i} \quad i = 1, \dots, n$$

Collecting all inequalities of the polyhedra  $p(\mathcal{P})$  for all possible projections  $p$  we obtain the required inequalities.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.7.** Consider the points of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+r+1}$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
P_1 &= (\alpha_1, 1, 0, \dots, 0, 0), \\
P_2 &= (\alpha_2, 0, 1, \dots, 0, 0), \\
&\vdots \\
P_r &= (\alpha_r, 0, 0, \dots, 1, 0), \\
P_{r+1} &= (\alpha_{r+1}, 0, 0, \dots, 0, 0).
\end{aligned}$$

The Newton polyhedron of  $P_1, P_2, \dots, P_r, P_{r+1}$  is defined by the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}
 x_i &\geq \alpha_{1,i} \\
 x_i + (\alpha_{2,i} - \alpha_{1,i})y_1 &\geq \alpha_{2,i} \\
 x_i + (\alpha_{3,i} - \alpha_{1,i})y_1 + (\alpha_{3,i} - \alpha_{2,i})y_2 &\geq \alpha_{3,i} \\
 &\dots\dots\dots \\
 x_i + (\alpha_{j,i} - \alpha_{1,i})y_1 + \dots + (\alpha_{j,i} - \alpha_{j-1,i})y_{j-1} &\geq \alpha_{j,i} \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \\
 &\dots\dots\dots \\
 x_i + (\alpha_{r,i} - \alpha_{1,i})y_1 + \dots + (\alpha_{r,i} - \alpha_{r-1,i})y_{r-1} &\geq \alpha_{r,i} \\
 x_i + (\alpha_{r+1,i} - \alpha_{1,i})y_1 + \dots + (\alpha_{r+1,i} - \alpha_{r,i})y_r &\geq \alpha_{r+1,i}
 \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* It follows from 4.6 by projecting  $v_{r+1}$  to zero.  $\square$

The computation of the log-canonical threshold of a general binomial ideal will be reduced to the two cases described by lemmas 4.8 and 4.9.

**Lemma 4.8.** *Let  $U$  be a smooth toric affine variety of dimension  $n$ . We know that  $U \cong \text{Spec}(k[x_1, \dots, x_n]_h)$ , where  $h$  is a product of some variables  $x_i$ .*

*Let  $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathcal{O}_U$  be the binomial ideal generated by*

$$f_i = x^{\alpha_i}(1 - u_i x^{\beta_i}), \quad i = 1, \dots, r,$$

*where  $x^{\alpha_i}$  and  $x^{\beta_i}$  are monomials in  $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]_h$  and  $u_i \in k^*$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, r$ . Set  $y_i = (1 - u_i x^{\beta_i})$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, r$ . We may assume that monomials  $x^{\alpha_i}$  do not depend on variables  $x_j$  appearing in  $h$ , these  $x_j$  are units in  $U$ .*

*Suppose that*

$$\alpha_1 \preceq \alpha_2 \preceq \dots \preceq \alpha_r$$

*where  $\preceq$  is the ordering defined in 3.4. Assume also that  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_r$  are  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent.*

*Let  $\Delta$  be the divisor defined by the monomial  $x^c$ . Then the  $\text{lct}(U, \Delta, \mathfrak{a})$  is the minimum of:*

$$\begin{aligned}
 &r, \\
 &\left\{ \frac{c_\ell + 1}{\alpha_{1,\ell}} \mid \ell = 1, \dots, n \right\}, \\
 &\left\{ \frac{c_\ell + 1 + (\alpha_{2,\ell} - \alpha_{1,\ell})}{\alpha_{2,\ell}} \mid \ell, \beta_{1,\ell} = 0 \right\}, \\
 &\left\{ \frac{c_\ell + 1 + (\alpha_{3,\ell} - \alpha_{1,\ell}) + (\alpha_{3,\ell} - \alpha_{2,\ell})}{\alpha_{3,\ell}} \mid \ell, \beta_{1,\ell} = \beta_{2,\ell} = 0 \right\}, \\
 &\dots\dots\dots \\
 &\left\{ \frac{c_\ell + 1 + (\alpha_{r,\ell} - \alpha_{1,\ell}) + \dots + (\alpha_{r,\ell} - \alpha_{r-1,\ell})}{\alpha_{r,\ell}} \mid \ell, \beta_{1,\ell} = \dots = \beta_{r-1,\ell} = 0 \right\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We cover  $U$  by open sets  $V_1, \dots, V_r, V_{r+1}$ :

- $V_1 = \{y_1 \neq 0\}$ ,
- $V_2 = \{y_2 \neq 0, x^{\beta_1} \neq 0\} = \{y_2 \neq 0, x_\ell \neq 0 \mid \forall \ell \text{ such that } \beta_{1,\ell} \neq 0\}$ ,
- $V_3 = \{y_3 \neq 0, x^{\beta_1 + \beta_2} \neq 0\} = \{y_3 \neq 0, x_\ell \neq 0 \mid \forall \ell \text{ such that } \beta_{1,\ell} \neq 0, \beta_{2,\ell} \neq 0\}$ ,
- $\dots\dots\dots$

- $V_i = \{y_i \neq 0, x^{\beta_1 \cdots + \beta_{i-1}} \neq 0\} =$   
 $= \{y_i \neq 0, x_\ell \neq 0 \mid \forall \ell \text{ such that } \beta_{1,\ell} \neq 0, \dots, \beta_{i-1,\ell} \neq 0\},$
- $\dots\dots$
- $V_r = \{y_r \neq 0, x^{\beta_1 \cdots + \beta_{r-1}} \neq 0\} =$   
 $= \{y_r \neq 0, x_\ell \neq 0 \mid \forall \ell \text{ such that } \beta_{1,\ell} \neq 0, \dots, \beta_{r-1,\ell} \neq 0\},$
- $V_{r+1} = \{x^{\beta_1 + \cdots + \beta_r} \neq 0\} = \{x_\ell \neq 0 \mid \forall \ell \text{ such that } \beta_{1,\ell} \neq 0, \dots, \beta_{r,\ell} \neq 0\}.$

At every open set  $V_s$ ,  $s = 1, \dots, r, r+1$  we have part of uniformizing parameters, say  $\Lambda_s = \{y_1, \dots, y_{s-1}\} \cup \{x_\ell \mid \beta_{1,\ell} = \beta_{2,\ell} = \cdots = \beta_{s-1,\ell} = 0\}.$

Note that the  $x_\ell$  with  $(\beta_{1,\ell}, \beta_{2,\ell}, \dots, \beta_{s-1,\ell}) \neq (0, \dots, 0)$  are units in  $V_s$ . We may complete  $\Lambda_s$  with some  $x_\ell$ , units in  $V_s$ , in order to have uniformizing parameters in  $V_s$ .

To be more precise, at every open set, we have a part of uniformizing parameters

- In  $V_1$ ,  $\Lambda_1 = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\},$
- in  $V_2$ ,  $\Lambda_2 = \{y_1\} \cup \{x_\ell \mid \beta_{1,\ell} = 0\},$
- $\dots\dots$
- in  $V_r$ ,  $\Lambda_r = \{y_1, \dots, y_{r-1}\} \cup \{x_\ell \mid \beta_{1,\ell} = \cdots = \beta_{r-1,\ell} = 0\},$
- in  $V_{r+1}$ ,  $\Lambda_{r+1} = \{y_1, \dots, y_r\} \cup \{x_\ell \mid \beta_{1,\ell} = \cdots = \beta_{r-1,\ell} = \beta_{r,\ell} = 0\}.$

At every open subset  $V_s$ ,  $s = 1, \dots, r, r+1$  the ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$  is monomial w.r.t  $\Lambda_s$ , respectively:

- $\mathfrak{a}|_{V_1} = \langle x^{\alpha_1} \rangle,$
- $\mathfrak{a}|_{V_2} = \langle x^{\alpha_1} y_1, x^{\alpha_2} \rangle,$
- $\dots\dots$
- $\mathfrak{a}|_{V_r} = \langle x^{\alpha_1} y_1, x^{\alpha_2} y_2, \dots, x^{\alpha_{r-1}} y_{r-1}, x^{\alpha_r} \rangle,$
- $\mathfrak{a}|_{V_{r+1}} = \langle x^{\alpha_1} y_1, x^{\alpha_2} y_2, \dots, x^{\alpha_{r-1}} y_{r-1}, x^{\alpha_r} y_r \rangle.$

For  $s = 1, \dots, r$  we claim that  $\text{lct}(V_s, \Delta, \mathfrak{a})$  is the minimum of

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{c_\ell + 1}{\alpha_{1,\ell}}, \\
 & \frac{c_\ell + 1 + (\alpha_{2,\ell} - \alpha_{1,\ell})}{\alpha_{2,\ell}}, \\
 & \frac{c_\ell + 1 + (\alpha_{3,\ell} - \alpha_{1,\ell}) + (\alpha_{3,\ell} - \alpha_{2,\ell})}{\alpha_{3,\ell}}, \\
 & \dots\dots\dots \\
 & \frac{c_\ell + 1 + (\alpha_{s,\ell} - \alpha_{1,\ell}) + \cdots + (\alpha_{s,\ell} - \alpha_{s-1,\ell})}{\alpha_{s,\ell}},
 \end{aligned}
 \quad \text{for } \ell \text{ such that } \beta_{1,\ell} = \cdots = \beta_{s-1,\ell} = 0.$$

Set  $\lambda_s = \text{lct}(V_s, \Delta, \mathbf{a})$  for  $s = 1, \dots, r$ . Lemma 4.7 gives the inequalities defining the Newton polyhedron defined by the monomials in  $V_s$ . Applying lemma 4.3 we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{c+1}{\lambda_s} &\geq \alpha_{1,i} \\ \frac{c+1}{\lambda_s} + (\alpha_{2,i} - \alpha_{1,i}) \frac{1}{\lambda_s} &\geq \alpha_{2,i} \\ \frac{c+1}{\lambda_s} + (\alpha_{3,i} - \alpha_{1,i}) \frac{1}{\lambda_s} + (\alpha_{3,i} - \alpha_{2,i}) \frac{1}{\lambda_s} &\geq \alpha_{3,i} \\ &\dots\dots\dots \\ \frac{c+1}{\lambda_s} + (\alpha_{s,i} - \alpha_{1,i}) \frac{1}{\lambda_s} + \dots + (\alpha_{s,i} - \alpha_{s-1,i}) \frac{1}{\lambda_s} &\geq \alpha_{s,i} \end{aligned}$$

and we have the claim.

For the open set  $V_{r+1}$ , by 4.6 we have to add the inequality

$$y_1 + \dots + y_r \geq 1.$$

Then  $\text{lct}(V_{r+1}, \Delta, \mathbf{a})$  is the minimum of  $r$  and

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{c_\ell + 1}{\alpha_{1,\ell}}, \\ &\frac{c_\ell + 1 + (\alpha_{2,\ell} - \alpha_{1,\ell})}{\alpha_{2,\ell}}, \\ &\frac{c_\ell + 1 + (\alpha_{3,\ell} - \alpha_{1,\ell}) + (\alpha_{3,\ell} - \alpha_{2,\ell})}{\alpha_{3,\ell}}, \\ &\dots\dots\dots \\ &\frac{c_\ell + 1 + (\alpha_{s,\ell} - \alpha_{1,\ell}) + \dots + (\alpha_{s,\ell} - \alpha_{s-1,\ell})}{\alpha_{s,\ell}}, \end{aligned} \quad \text{for } \ell \text{ such that } \beta_{1,\ell} = \dots = \beta_{r,\ell} = 0,$$

and we conclude the result.  $\square$

Note that in lemma 4.8 the ideal was generated only by binomials, if we add a monomial to the generators then the result is very similar.

**Lemma 4.9.** *Let  $U$  be a smooth toric affine variety of dimension  $n$ . As in 4.8 we have  $U \cong \text{Spec}(k[x_1, \dots, x_n]_h)$ , where  $h$  is a product of some variables  $x_i$ . Let  $\mathbf{a} \subset \mathcal{O}_U$  be the general binomial ideal generated by  $r$  binomials  $f_1, \dots, f_r$  and one monomial  $f_{r+1} = x^{\alpha_{r+1}}$ , where*

$$f_i = x^{\alpha_i}(1 - u_i x^{\beta_i}), \quad i = 1, \dots, r,$$

and  $x^{\alpha_i}, x^{\beta_i}$  are monomials in  $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]_h$  and  $u_i \in k^*$ . Set  $y_i = (1 - u_i x^{\beta_i})$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, r$ . We may assume that monomials  $x^{\alpha_i}$  do not depend on variables  $x_j$  appearing in  $h$ , since these  $x_j$  are units in  $U$ .

Suppose that

$$\alpha_1 \preceq \alpha_2 \preceq \dots \preceq \alpha_r \preceq \alpha_{r+1}$$

where  $\preceq$  is the ordering defined in 3.4. Assume also that  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_r$  are  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent.

Let  $\Delta$  be the divisor defined by the monomial  $x^c$ . Then the  $\text{lct}(U, \Delta, \mathbf{a})$  is the minimum of:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ \frac{c_\ell + 1}{\alpha_{1,\ell}} \mid \ell = 1, \dots, n \right\}, \\ & \left\{ \frac{c_\ell + 1 + (\alpha_{2,\ell} - \alpha_{1,\ell})}{\alpha_{2,\ell}} \mid \ell, \beta_{1,\ell} = 0 \right\}, \\ & \left\{ \frac{c_\ell + 1 + (\alpha_{3,\ell} - \alpha_{1,\ell}) + (\alpha_{3,\ell} - \alpha_{2,\ell})}{\alpha_{3,\ell}} \mid \ell, \beta_{1,\ell} = \beta_{2,\ell} = 0 \right\}, \\ & \dots\dots\dots \\ & \left\{ \frac{c_\ell + 1 + (\alpha_{r,\ell} - \alpha_{1,\ell}) + \dots + (\alpha_{r,\ell} - \alpha_{r-1,\ell})}{\alpha_{r,\ell}} \mid \ell, \beta_{1,\ell} = \dots = \beta_{r-1,\ell} = 0 \right\}, \\ & \left\{ \frac{c_\ell + 1 + (\alpha_{r+1,\ell} - \alpha_{1,\ell}) + \dots + (\alpha_{r+1,\ell} - \alpha_{r,\ell})}{\alpha_{r+1,\ell}} \mid \ell, \beta_{1,\ell} = \dots = \beta_{r-1,\ell} = \beta_{r,\ell} = 0 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* The proof is analogous to the proof of 4.8.  $\square$

Lemmas 4.8 and 4.9 describe all the cases that occur for a pseudo resolution of a general binomial ideal. We may cover the pseudo resolution of the ideal by open sets such that the total transform is either in the situation of lemma 4.8 or lemma 4.9.

**Theorem 4.10.** *Let  $W = U_\tau$  be a  $n$ -dimensional affine smooth toric variety associated to a cone  $\tau$ . Consider a set of vertices  $\Xi = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$  extending the rays of  $\tau$ . Let  $\mathbf{a} \subset \mathcal{O}_W$  be a general binomial ideal (2.10). The ideal  $\mathbf{a}$  is generated by binomials and monomials  $f_1, \dots, f_r$ , where either  $f_i = v^{a_i} - u_i v^{b_i}$  or  $f_i = v^{a_i}$ , with  $a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$  and  $u_i \in k^*$ .*

*If  $f_i$  is a monomial  $v^{a_i}$  then set  $b_i = a_i$  and  $u_i = 0$ . Set  $\gamma_i = b_i - a_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, r$  and let  $s$  to be the rank of the matrix with rows  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r$ .*

*Let  $\Pi : W' \rightarrow U$  be a pseudo-resolution of the ideal  $\mathbf{a} \subset \mathcal{O}_W$  for the generators  $f_1, \dots, f_r$ . The morphism  $\Pi$  is defined by a subdivision  $\Sigma'$  of the cone  $\tau$  defining the affine toric variety  $W$ . Fix  $\Xi' \supset \Xi$  to be a set of vertices for  $\Sigma'$ . The total transform  $\mathbf{a} \mathcal{O}_{W'}$  is generated by the total transforms of the original monomials and binomials, say  $f_1^*, \dots, f_r^*$ . If  $\Xi' = \{v_1, \dots, v_m\}$ , for some  $m \geq n$ , then for  $i = 1, \dots, r$  either*

$$f_i^* = v^{\alpha_i} (v^{\beta_i^+} - u_i v^{\beta_i^-}) \quad \text{or} \quad f_i^* = v^{\alpha_i}$$

*since  $\Pi$  is a pseudo-resolution (3.5).*

*Denote by  $v^c$  the monomial defining the canonical divisor  $K_{W'/W}$  in  $W'$ .*

*For every  $\ell = 1, \dots, m$  denote by  $\varepsilon_\ell$  a permutation of the finite set  $\{1, \dots, r\}$  such that*

$$\alpha_{\varepsilon_\ell(1),\ell} \leq \alpha_{\varepsilon_\ell(2),\ell} \leq \dots \leq \alpha_{\varepsilon_\ell(r),\ell}$$

*Set  $r_\ell$  to be the minimum index such that  $\langle f_{\varepsilon_\ell(1)}, f_{\varepsilon_\ell(2)}, \dots, f_{\varepsilon_\ell(r_\ell)} \rangle \mathcal{O}_\mathbb{T} = \mathcal{O}_\mathbb{T}$ , where  $\mathbb{T} \subset W$  is the embedded torus of the toric variety. We set  $r_\ell = r + 1$  if  $\langle f_1, \dots, f_r \rangle \mathcal{O}_\mathbb{T} \neq \mathcal{O}_\mathbb{T}$ . Denote by  $1 = n_1 < n_2 < \dots < n_{s_\ell} < n_{s_\ell+1} = r_\ell$  the increasing sequence of natural numbers such that for every  $j$  with  $n_i < j < n_{i+1}$*

$$\langle f_{\varepsilon_\ell(1)}, f_{\varepsilon_\ell(2)}, \dots, f_{\varepsilon_\ell(n_i)} \rangle \mathcal{O}_\mathbb{T} = \langle f_{\varepsilon_\ell(1)}, f_{\varepsilon_\ell(2)}, \dots, f_{\varepsilon_\ell(j)} \rangle \mathcal{O}_\mathbb{T}.$$

*Note that the sequence  $n_1, \dots, n_{s_\ell}$  depends on  $\ell$ .*

Finally set  $\tilde{s}_\ell = s$  if  $r_\ell = r+1$  and set  $\tilde{s}_\ell = \infty$  otherwise. Then  $\text{lct}(W, \mathbf{a})$  is the minimum of

$$\begin{aligned}
& \tilde{s}_\ell, \\
& \left\{ \frac{c_\ell + 1}{\alpha_{\varepsilon_\ell(n_1), \ell}} \mid \forall \ell = 1, \dots, m \right\}, \\
& \left\{ \frac{c_\ell + 1 + (\alpha_{\varepsilon_\ell(n_2), \ell} - \alpha_{\varepsilon_\ell(n_1), \ell})}{\alpha_{\varepsilon_\ell(n_2), \ell}} \mid \forall \ell, \beta_{\varepsilon_\ell(n_1), \ell} = 0 \right\}, \\
& \left\{ \frac{c_\ell + 1 + (\alpha_{\varepsilon_\ell(n_3), \ell} - \alpha_{\varepsilon_\ell(n_1), \ell}) + (\alpha_{\varepsilon_\ell(n_3), \ell} - \alpha_{\varepsilon_\ell(n_2), \ell})}{\alpha_{\varepsilon_\ell(n_3), \ell}} \mid \forall \ell, \beta_{\varepsilon_\ell(n_1), \ell} = \beta_{\varepsilon_\ell(n_2), \ell} = 0 \right\}, \\
& \dots\dots\dots \\
& \left\{ \frac{c_\ell + 1 + (\alpha_{\varepsilon_\ell(n_{s_\ell}), \ell} - \alpha_{\varepsilon_\ell(n_1), \ell}) + \dots + (\alpha_{\varepsilon_\ell(n_{s_\ell}), \ell} - \alpha_{\varepsilon_\ell(n_{s_\ell-1}), \ell})}{\alpha_{\varepsilon_\ell(n_{s_\ell}), \ell}} \mid \right. \\
& \quad \left. \forall \ell, \beta_{\varepsilon_\ell(n_1), \ell} = \dots = \beta_{\varepsilon_\ell(n_{s_\ell-1}), \ell} = 0 \right\}, \\
& \left\{ \frac{c_\ell + 1 + (\alpha_{\varepsilon_\ell(n_{s_\ell+1}), \ell} - \alpha_{\varepsilon_\ell(n_1), \ell}) + \dots + (\alpha_{\varepsilon_\ell(n_{s_\ell+1}), \ell} - \alpha_{\varepsilon_\ell(n_{s_\ell}), \ell})}{\alpha_{\varepsilon_\ell(n_{s_\ell+1}), \ell}} \mid \right. \\
& \quad \left. \forall \ell, \beta_{\varepsilon_\ell(n_1), \ell} = \dots = \beta_{\varepsilon_\ell(n_{s_\ell}), \ell} = 0 \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last expression only takes effect if  $r_\ell \leq r$ .

*Proof.* First note that the matrix with rows  $\gamma_{i_1}, \dots, \gamma_{i_q}$  for some  $i_1, \dots, i_q$  has the same rank as the matrix  $\beta_{i_1}, \dots, \beta_{i_q}$ , this comes from 3.1.

Let  $\sigma \in \Sigma'$  be a cone defining an affine open set  $U_\sigma \subset W'$ . We know that  $U_\sigma \cong k[x_1, \dots, x_n]_h$  where  $h$  is a product of some variables. The ideal  $\mathbf{a} \mathcal{O}_{U_\sigma}$  is generated by binomials and monomials

$$\text{either } f'_i = x^{\alpha'_i} (1 - u'_i x^{\beta'_i}) \text{ or } f'_i = x^{\alpha'_i}, \quad i = 1, \dots, r.$$

Where the  $\alpha'_i, \beta'_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$  come by neglecting some coordinates from  $\alpha_i, \beta_i$  and  $u'_i$  is either  $u_i$  or  $u_i^{-1}$ . Note also that the matrix with rows  $\gamma_{i_1}, \dots, \gamma_{i_q}$  for some  $i_1, \dots, i_q$  has the same rank as the matrix  $\beta'_{i_1}, \dots, \beta'_{i_q}$ , see 2.8.

Since  $W' \rightarrow W$  is a pseudo resolution,  $\alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_r$  are totally ordered with respect to  $\preceq$ . After reordering variables  $x_i$  we may assume that

$$\alpha'_1 \preceq \alpha'_2 \preceq \dots \preceq \alpha'_r.$$

Set  $r_0$  to be the minimum index such that

$$\langle 1 - u'_1 x^{\beta'_1}, 1 - u'_2 x^{\beta'_2}, \dots, 1 - u'_{r_0} x^{\beta'_{r_0}} \rangle = \langle 1 \rangle,$$

we set  $r_0 = r + 1$  if

$$\langle 1 - u'_1 x^{\beta'_1}, 1 - u'_2 x^{\beta'_2}, \dots, 1 - u'_r x^{\beta'_r} \rangle \neq \langle 1 \rangle.$$

The ideal  $\mathfrak{a}\mathcal{O}_{U_\sigma}$  is generated by

$$\begin{aligned} & x^{\alpha'_1}(1 - u'_1 x^{\beta'_1}), \dots, x^{\alpha'_{r_0-1}}(1 - u'_{r_0-1} x^{\beta'_{r_0-1}}), x^{\alpha'_{r_0}} \quad \text{if } r_0 \leq r, \\ & x^{\alpha'_1}(1 - u'_1 x^{\beta'_1}), \dots, x^{\alpha'_{r_0-1}}(1 - u'_{r_0-1} x^{\beta'_{r_0-1}}) \quad \text{if } r_0 = r + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $1 = n_1 < n_2 < \dots < n_{s_0} < n_{s_0+1} = r_0$  be the sequence such that for every  $j$  with  $n_i < j < n_{i+1}$

$$\left\langle 1 - u'_1 x^{\beta'_1}, \dots, 1 - u'_{n_j-1} x^{\beta'_{n_i}} \right\rangle \subsetneq \left\langle 1 - u'_1 x^{\beta'_1}, \dots, 1 - u'_{n_j} x^{\beta'_j} \right\rangle$$

Note that this is equivalent to:

- $\beta'_{n_1}, \dots, \beta'_{n_{s_0}}$  are  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent and
- for every  $j$  with  $n_i < j < n_{i+1}$  then  $\beta'_j$  is in the  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear span of the vectors  $\beta'_{n_1}, \dots, \beta'_{n_i}$ .

Denote by  $\Delta = -K_{W'/W}|_{U_\sigma}$  and assume it is defined by the monomial  $x^c$ . Then it is enough to proof that  $\text{lct}(U_\sigma, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}\mathcal{O}_{U_\sigma})$  is the minimum of

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{s}, \\ & \left\{ \frac{c_\ell + 1}{\alpha'_{n_1, \ell}} \mid \forall \ell = 1, \dots, n \right\}, \\ & \left\{ \frac{c_\ell + 1 + (\alpha'_{n_2, \ell} - \alpha'_{n_1, \ell})}{\alpha'_{n_2, \ell}} \mid \forall \ell, \beta'_{n_1, \ell} = 0 \right\}, \\ & \left\{ \frac{c_\ell + 1 + (\alpha'_{n_3, \ell} - \alpha'_{n_1, \ell}) + (\alpha'_{n_3, \ell} - \alpha'_{n_2, \ell})}{\alpha'_{n_3, \ell}} \mid \forall \ell, \beta'_{n_1, \ell} = \beta'_{n_2, \ell} = 0 \right\}, \\ & \dots\dots\dots \\ & \left\{ \frac{c_\ell + 1 + (\alpha'_{n_{s_0}, \ell} - \alpha'_{n_1, \ell}) + \dots + (\alpha'_{n_{s_0}, \ell} - \alpha'_{n_{s_0-1}, \ell})}{\alpha'_{n_{s_0}, \ell}} \mid \right. \\ & \qquad \qquad \qquad \left. \forall \ell, \beta'_{n_1, \ell} = \dots = \beta'_{n_{s_0-1}, \ell} = 0 \right\}, \\ & \left\{ \frac{c_\ell + 1 + (\alpha'_{n_{s_0+1}, \ell} - \alpha'_{n_1, \ell}) + \dots + (\alpha'_{n_{s_0+1}, \ell} - \alpha'_{n_{s_0}, \ell})}{\alpha'_{n_{s_0+1}, \ell}} \mid \right. \\ & \qquad \qquad \qquad \left. \forall \ell, \beta'_{n_1, \ell} = \dots = \beta'_{n_{s_0}, \ell} = 0 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last expression only takes effect if  $r_0 \leq r$ .

Applying lemma 4.5 we can cover  $U_\sigma$  by open sets  $U_0, U_1, \dots, U_{s'}, U_{s'+1}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{a}\mathcal{O}_{U_0} &= \mathcal{O}_{U_0}, \\ \mathfrak{a}\mathcal{O}_{U_1} &= \langle x^{\alpha'_{n_1}} \rangle, \\ \mathfrak{a}\mathcal{O}_{U_2} &= \langle x^{\alpha'_{n_1}}(1 - u'_{n_1} x^{\beta'_{n_1}}), x^{\alpha'_{n_2}} \rangle, \\ &\dots\dots\dots \\ \mathfrak{a}\mathcal{O}_{U_{s_0}} &= \langle x^{\alpha'_{n_1}}(1 - u'_{n_1} x^{\beta'_{n_1}}), x^{\alpha'_{n_2}}(1 - u'_{n_2} x^{\beta'_{n_2}}), \dots, x^{\alpha'_{n_{s_0-1}}}(1 - u'_{n_{s_0-1}} x^{\beta'_{n_{s_0-1}}}), x^{\alpha'_{n_{s_0}}} \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathfrak{a} \mathcal{O}_{U_{s_0+1}} = \langle x^{\alpha'_{n_1}}(1 - u'_{n_1} x^{\beta'_{n_1}}), x^{\alpha'_{n_2}}(1 - u'_{n_2} x^{\beta'_{n_2}}), \dots \\ \dots, x^{\alpha'_{n_{s_0-1}}}(1 - u'_{n_{s_0-1}} x^{\beta'_{n_{s_0-1}}}), x^{\alpha'_{n_{s_0}}}(1 - u'_{n_{s_0}} x^{\beta'_{n_{s_0}}}), x^{\alpha_{r_0}} \rangle,$$

where in case  $r_0 = r + 1$  we set  $x^{\alpha_{r_0}} = 0$ . Finally the result follows now from lemmas 4.8 and 4.9.  $\square$

**Remark 4.11.** Let  $W = U_\tau$  be a  $n$ -dimensional affine smooth toric variety associated to a cone  $\tau$  as in 4.10, fix a point  $\xi \in U_\tau$  in the orbit of the distinguished point of  $U_\tau$  (see [CLS11, page 116]) and assume that the general binomial ideal  $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathcal{O}_{U_\tau}$  is such that  $\mathfrak{a}_\xi \neq \mathcal{O}_{U_\tau, \xi}$ , then

$$\text{lct}(U_\tau, \Delta, \mathfrak{a})_\xi = \text{lct}(U_\tau, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}).$$

If  $W = W_\Sigma$  is a smooth toric variety and  $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathcal{O}_W$  is a general binomial ideal (2.10) then

$$\text{lct}(W, \Delta, \mathfrak{a}) = \min \{ \text{lct}(U_\sigma, \Delta|_{U_\sigma}, \mathfrak{a}|_{U_\sigma}) \mid \sigma \in \Sigma \}.$$

For a point  $\xi \in W$  such that  $\mathfrak{a}_\xi \neq \mathcal{O}_{W, \xi}$ , set  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  the unique cone such that  $\xi \in U_\sigma$  and  $\xi$  is in the orbit of the distinguished point of  $U_\sigma$  (see [CLS11, page 116]), we have that

$$\text{lct}(W, \Delta, \mathfrak{a})_\xi = \text{lct}(U_\tau, \Delta|_{U_\tau}, \mathfrak{a}|_{U_\tau}).$$

Theorem 4.10 gives a way of computing the log-canonical threshold of a general binomial ideal, but one needs to compute a pseudo-resolution of the ideal. We want to avoid this computation and express the log-canonical threshold of the ideal in terms of simpler computations.

**Definition 4.12.** Let  $W = \mathbb{A}_k^n = \text{Spec}(k[x_1, \dots, x_n])$  be the  $n$ -dimensional affine space. Let  $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathcal{O}_W$  be a general binomial ideal (2.10) generated by  $f_1, \dots, f_r$ . Where  $f_i$  is either a monomial  $x^{a_i}$  or a binomial  $x^{a_i} - u_i x^{b_i}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, r$ ,  $a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$  and  $u_i \in k^*$ . We associate to the ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$  a triple  $(M^+, M^-, u) = (M_a^+, M_a^-, u_a)$ , where  $M^+$  and  $M^-$  are  $r \times n$  matrices and  $u \in k^n$ . For  $i = 1, \dots, r$  set

- $M_i^+ = M_i^- = a_i$  and  $u_i = 0$ , if  $f_i = x^{a_i}$  is a monomial, and
- $M_i^+ = a_i$ ,  $M_i^- = b_i$  and  $u_i = u_i$ , if  $f_i = x^{a_i} - u_i x^{b_i}$  is a binomial.

Where we denote  $M_i^\pm$  the  $i$ -th row of the matrix  $M^\pm$ .

Note that the entries of the matrices  $M^+$  and  $M^-$  are non-negative integers.

**Definition 4.13.** Let  $(M^+, M^-, u)$  be the triple associated to a general binomial ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$ . Denote  $M_i^+$  and  $M_i^-$  the  $i$ -th row of the matrices,  $i = 1, \dots, r$  and set  $M = M^+ - M^-$ . We define the function  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)} : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , for  $v \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$  set

- $s$  to be the rank of the matrix  $M^+ - M^-$ ,
- $\alpha = \alpha_v = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r) = \min\{M^+v, M^-v\}$ , where the minimum is taken for every component,
- $\beta = \beta_v = Mv = (M^+ - M^-)v$ ,
- $\varepsilon$  to be a permutation of  $\{1, \dots, r\}$  such that

$$\alpha_{\varepsilon(1)} \leq \alpha_{\varepsilon(2)} \leq \dots \leq \alpha_{\varepsilon(r)},$$

- $r_0$  to be the minimum index such that

$$\langle f_{\varepsilon(1)}, f_{\varepsilon(2)}, \dots, f_{\varepsilon(r_0)} \rangle k[x_1^\pm, \dots, x_n^\pm] = k[x_1^\pm, \dots, x_n^\pm],$$

set  $r_0 = r + 1$  if

$$\langle f_1, f_2, \dots, f_r \rangle k[x_1^\pm, \dots, x_n^\pm] \neq k[x_1^\pm, \dots, x_n^\pm],$$

- $\tilde{s} = \infty$  if  $r_0 \leq r$  and  $\tilde{s} = s$  otherwise,
- denote by  $1 = n_1 < n_2 < \dots < n_{s_0} < n_{s_0+1} = r_0$  the sequence such that
  - the rows  $M_{\varepsilon(n_1)}, \dots, M_{\varepsilon(n_{s_0})}$  are  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly independent and
  - for every  $j$  with  $n_i < j < n_{i+1}$  then the row  $M_{\varepsilon(j)}$  is in the  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear span of the rows  $M_{\varepsilon(n_1)}, \dots, M_{\varepsilon(n_i)}$ ,
- and set  $s_v \leq \min\{s_0 + 1, r\}$  the maximum index such that  $\beta_{\varepsilon(n_1)} = \beta_{\varepsilon(n_2)} = \dots = \beta_{\varepsilon(n_{s_v-1})} = 0$ .

We define  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}(v)$  to be the minimum of

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{s}, \\ & \frac{|v|}{\alpha_{\varepsilon(n_1)}}, \\ & \frac{|v| + (\alpha_{\varepsilon(n_2)} - \alpha_{\varepsilon(n_1)})}{\alpha_{\varepsilon(n_2)}}, \\ & \dots, \\ & \frac{|v| + (\alpha_{\varepsilon(n_{s_v})} - \alpha_{\varepsilon(n_{s_v-1})}) + \dots + (\alpha_{\varepsilon(n_{s_v})} - \alpha_{\varepsilon(n_1)})}{\alpha_{\varepsilon(n_{s_v})}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $|v| = v_1 + \dots + v_n$ .

We also define  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}^*(v) = \frac{|v|}{\alpha_{\varepsilon(n_1)}}$ .

Note that  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}^* = \text{lct}_{(N, N, 0)}$ , where  $N$  is the  $2r \times n$  matrix obtained by joining the rows of  $M^+$  and  $M^-$ . In terms of ideals, if the triple  $(M^+, M^-, u)$  corresponds to a general binomial ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$  then the triple  $(N, N, 0)$  corresponds to the monomial ideal generated by all monomials appearing in the generators of  $\mathfrak{a}$ . Note also that in definition 4.13 the coefficients  $u$  are used only to set the index  $r_0$ .

We will prove in 4.18 that the minimum value of  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}$  is the log canonical threshold of  $\mathfrak{a}$ , so that the minimum of  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}^*$  is the minimum of the previous monomial ideal.

The value of  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}(v)$  only depends on the ray defining  $v$ .

**Lemma 4.14.**  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}(v) = \text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}(\lambda v)$ , for every  $\lambda > 0$ .

*Proof.* It follows from the definition 4.12. □

This means that the map  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}$  is, in some sense, projective.

**Example 4.15.** Set  $W = \text{Spec}(k[x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4])$  and let  $\mathfrak{a} \subset k[x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4]$  be the ideal defining the monomial curve  $(t^6, t^8, t^{10}, t^{11})$ .

$$\mathfrak{a} = \langle x_2^2 - x_1x_3, x_1^3 - x_2x_3, x_1^2x_2 - x_3^2, x_1^2x_3 - x_4^2 \rangle$$

The triple associated to  $\mathfrak{a}$  is  $(M^+, M^-, u)$  where

$$M^+ = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad M^- = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad u = (1, 1, 1, 1).$$

We compute the value  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}(v)$  for  $v = (6, 8, 10, 11)$ . The ingredients in definition 4.13 are the following:

The rank of  $M = M^+ - M^-$  is  $s = 3$ .

$$\alpha = \alpha_v = \min\{M^+v, M^-v\} = (16, 18, 20, 22), \quad \beta = \beta_v = (M^+ - M^-)v = (0, 0, 0, 0).$$

The permutation  $\varepsilon$  is the identity and since  $\mathbf{a}k[x_1^\pm, x_2^\pm, x_3^\pm, x_4^\pm] \neq k[x_1^\pm, x_2^\pm, x_3^\pm, x_4^\pm]$  then  $r_0 = 5$ . The sequence  $n_1 < n_2 < n_3 < n_4 = r_0 = 5$  is  $n_1 = 1, n_2 = 2, n_3 = 4$ . Since  $\beta = 0$  then  $s_v = s_0 = 3$ . Note that the third row of the matrix  $M$  is in the linear span of the first two rows. Finally  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}(v)$  is the minimum of

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{s} &= 3, \\ \frac{|v|}{\alpha_{\varepsilon(n_1)}} &= \frac{35}{16}, \\ \frac{|v| + (\alpha_{\varepsilon(n_2)} - \alpha_{\varepsilon(n_1)})}{\alpha_{\varepsilon(n_2)}} &= \frac{37}{18}, \\ \frac{|v| + (\alpha_{\varepsilon(n_3)} - \alpha_{\varepsilon(n_2)}) + (\alpha_{\varepsilon(n_3)} - \alpha_{\varepsilon(n_1)})}{\alpha_{\varepsilon(n_{s_v})}} &= \frac{45}{22}, \end{aligned}$$

so that  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}(v) = 45/22$ .

Now consider the ideal

$$\mathbf{a}_1 = \langle x_2^2 - x_1x_3, x_1^3 - x_2x_3, x_1^2x_2 + x_3^2, x_1^2x_3 - x_4^2 \rangle.$$

Note that the generators of  $\mathbf{a}_1$  only differ in one coefficient from those of  $\mathbf{a}$ . The triple associated to  $\mathbf{a}_1$  is  $(M^+, M^-, u_1)$  with the same matrices and  $u_1 = (1, 1, -1, 1)$ .

In this case we have that

$$\langle x_2^2 - x_1x_3, x_1^3 - x_2x_3, x_1^2x_2 + x_3^2 \rangle k[x_1^\pm, x_2^\pm, x_3^\pm, x_4^\pm] = k[x_1^\pm, x_2^\pm, x_3^\pm, x_4^\pm].$$

So that  $r_0 = 3$  and the sequence  $n_1 < n_2 < n_3 = r_0 = 3$  is  $n_1 = 1, n_2 = 2$ . We conclude that  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}(v) = 41/20$

The function  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}$  is not continuous in general, but we may stratify the space  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$  such that the function  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}$  is continuous in every stratum. In fact this stratification is given by a fan.

**Proposition 4.16.** *Let  $(M^+, M^-, u)$  be the triple associated to  $\mathbf{a}$ .*

*There is a fan  $\Gamma$ , with support  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ , such that for every cone  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  the function  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}$  is continuous in the relative interior of  $\gamma$ .*

*Proof.* Denote by  $M_i^+$  and  $M_i^-$  the  $i$ -th row of the matrix  $M^+$  and  $M^-$ , respectively. Consider the hyperplanes of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  having normal vectors:

$$(4.16.1) \quad \begin{aligned} M_i^+ - M_i^- & \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \\ M_i^\pm - M_j^\pm & \quad i < j. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\Gamma$  be the fan obtained by the subdivision of  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$  given by these hyperplanes. For every cone  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  the relative interior of  $\gamma$  is defined by some hyperplane equalities and some hyperplane inequalities,  $\geq 0$  or  $\leq 0$  of (4.16.1).

By our construction, the permutation  $\varepsilon$  and the sequence  $n_1 < \dots < n_{s_0}$  in definition 4.13 are the same for all  $v$  in the relative interior of  $\gamma$ . The function  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}$  in the relative interior of  $\gamma$  is continuous since it is the minimum of continuous functions.  $\square$

Note that our fan  $\Gamma$  is a subdivision of the fan constructed in [Tei04, Proposition 6.3].

**Proposition 4.17.** *Let  $W = \mathbb{A}_k^n$  and let  $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathcal{O}_W$  be a general binomial ideal generated by binomials and monomials  $f_1, \dots, f_r$ . Let  $(M^+, M^-, u)$  be the triple associated to  $\mathfrak{a}$  (4.12).*

*Let  $\Pi : W' \rightarrow W$  be a pseudo-resolution of the ideal  $\mathfrak{a}\mathcal{O}_W$  for the generators  $f_1, \dots, f_r$  defined by a subdivision  $\Sigma'$  of  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ . Let  $\Xi' = \Sigma'(1)$  be the set of rays of  $\Sigma'$ . If  $\Xi' = \{v_1, \dots, v_m\}$ , for some  $m \geq n$ , then*

$$\text{lct}(W, \mathfrak{a}) = \min \{ \text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}(v_i) \mid i = 1, \dots, m \}$$

*Proof.* It follows from the definition 4.13 and theorem 4.10.  $\square$

Proposition 4.17 gives a way of computing  $\text{lct}(W, \mathfrak{a})$  in terms of the rays of a pseudo-resolution of the ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$ , and the value  $\text{lct}(W, \mathfrak{a})$  is bigger than or equal that the minimum value (if it exists) of the function  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}$ .

In fact, we prove that the minimum of the function  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}$  exists and it is equal to  $\text{lct}(W, \mathfrak{a})$ .

**Theorem 4.18.** *Let  $W = \mathbb{A}_k^n$  and let  $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathcal{O}_W$  be a general binomial ideal generated by binomials and monomials  $f_1, \dots, f_r$ . Let  $(M^+, M^-, u)$  be the triple associated to  $\mathfrak{a}$  (4.12).*

*Then the lct of the ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$  is the minimum of the function  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}$ :*

$$\text{lct}(W, \mathfrak{a}) = \min \{ \text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}(v) \mid v \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \}.$$

*Proof.* First note that  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}(v) \geq 0$  so that  $\inf \{ \text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}(v) \mid v \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \}$  exists. By 4.17 we have

$$\text{lct}(W, \mathfrak{a}) \geq \inf \{ \text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}(v) \mid v \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \}.$$

We only have to prove the reverse inequality.

If  $v \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}^n$ , let  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $mv \in \mathbb{N}^n$ . Consider a subdivision  $\Sigma_1$  of  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$  containing  $mv$  and refine  $\Sigma_1$  in order to have a subdivision  $\Sigma_2$  and a pseudo-resolution of  $\mathfrak{a}$  with  $mv$  a ray of  $\Sigma_2$ . By 4.17 and 4.14

$$\text{lct}(W, \mathfrak{a}) \leq \text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}(mv) = \text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}(v).$$

Let  $\Gamma$  the fan of proposition 4.16. If  $v \in \Gamma(1)$  then there exist  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $\lambda v \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}^n$  and again by lemma 4.14 we obtain the above inequality.

Assume that  $v \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$  and  $v \notin \Gamma(1)$ , there exists a unique cone  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  with  $v$  in the relative interior of  $\gamma$ . There are  $w_\ell \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}^n$ , for  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , with

- $w_\ell$  in the relative interior of  $\gamma$  and
- $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} w_\ell = v$ .

We have seen that

$$\text{lct}(W, \mathfrak{a}) \leq \text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}(w_\ell) \quad \forall \ell \in \mathbb{N}.$$

It follows from proposition 4.16 that

$$\text{lct}(W, \mathfrak{a}) \leq \text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}(v) = \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}(w_\ell).$$

$\square$

By 4.18, the problem of computing  $\text{lct}(W, \mathfrak{a})$  is reduced to the problem of computing the minimum of the function  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-)}$ . The last problem relies on computing the rays of the fan determined by the rows of the matrices  $M^+$  and  $M^-$ .

**Proposition 4.19.** *Let  $(M^+, M^-, u)$  be the triple associated to  $\mathfrak{a}$  and let  $\Gamma$  be the fan given by 4.16.*

*The minimum of the function  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}$  (4.13) is attained at some ray of the fan  $\Gamma$ . If  $\Gamma(1) = \{w_1, \dots, w_t\}$  then*

$$\min \text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)} = \min \{ \text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}(w_i) \mid i = 1, \dots, t \}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  be a cone. As in the proof of 4.16 There is a permutation  $\varepsilon$  of  $\{1, \dots, r\}$  such that, with the notation of 4.13,

$$\alpha_{v, \varepsilon(1)} \leq \alpha_{v, \varepsilon(2)} \leq \dots \leq \alpha_{v, \varepsilon(r)} \quad \forall v \in \gamma.$$

For  $v$  in the relative interior of  $\gamma$  set  $\varphi(v) = \text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}(v)$ . Consider the function  $\varphi : \gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  extended by continuity to the relative boundary.

**Claim 1:** If  $v \in \gamma$  is such that  $\varphi(v) = \inf \varphi$  then  $v$  is in the relative boundary of  $\gamma$ .

**Claim 2:** If  $v$  is in the relative boundary of  $\gamma$  then  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}(v) \leq \varphi(v)$ .

First note that proposition will follow from claim 1 and claim 2.

For claim 1, note that  $\varphi$  is the minimum of functions like

$$\varphi_i(v) = \frac{|v| + (\alpha_{v, \varepsilon(n_i)} - \alpha_{v, \varepsilon(n_{i-1})}) + \dots + (\alpha_{v, \varepsilon(n_i)} - \alpha_{v, \varepsilon(n_1)})}{\alpha_{v, \varepsilon(n_i)}}$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, s_v$ . Since the  $\alpha_{v, \varepsilon(n_j)}$  are linear functions on  $v \in \gamma$  and  $\varphi_i(\lambda v) = \varphi_i(v)$  (4.14) we have that

$$\inf \{ \varphi_i(v) \mid v \in \gamma \} = \inf \{ \varphi_i(v) \mid \alpha_{v, \varepsilon(n_i)} = 1, v \in \gamma \}.$$

The function  $\varphi_i$  restricted to the hyperplane  $\alpha_{v, \varepsilon(n_i)} = 1$  is a linear function and its minimum will be attained at some point of the boundary of the domain. This proves claim 1.

For claim 2 note that the number  $s_v$  is constant for all  $v$  in the relative interior of  $\gamma$ . If  $v'$  is in the relative boundary of  $\gamma$  then  $s_{v'} \geq s_v$  and claim 2 follows.  $\square$

## 5. COMPUTATION AND EXAMPLES

We describe a simple procedure to compute the rays of the fan  $\Gamma$  appearing in proposition 4.19. It is a naive procedure, but even if it may be improved it avoids any computation of a pseudo-resolution of the ideal. In fact, complexity is bounded only in terms of the number of variables  $n$  and the number of generators  $r$ .

**Remark 5.1.** Let  $\mathfrak{a} \subset k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  be a general binomial ideal generated by  $f_1, \dots, f_r$ , where each  $f_i$  is either a monomial or a binomial. Set  $(M^+, M^-, u)$  be the triple associated to  $f_1, \dots, f_r$  (4.12). We denote  $M_i^\pm$  the  $i$ -th row of the matrix  $M^\pm$ .

By 4.19 we shall check the minimum of the values  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}(v)$  for every  $v \in \Gamma(1)$ , where  $\Gamma$  is the fan given by 4.16.

Set  $A$  to be the identity  $n \times n$  matrix. Following proof of 4.16, add to the matrix  $A$  the rows

$$\begin{aligned} M_i^+ - M_i^- & \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \\ M_i^\pm - M_j^\pm & \quad i < j. \end{aligned}$$

We may delete some rows of  $A$ :

- every row with  $A_i = 0$ ,

| Ray              | lct         |               | lct*  |        | Ray       | lct |   | lct*     |          |
|------------------|-------------|---------------|-------|--------|-----------|-----|---|----------|----------|
| (2, 1, 3)        | 3           | 3             | 3     | 3      | (1, 3, 0) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| (2, 2, 3)        | 7/4         | 1.75          | 7/4   | 1.75   | (1, 1, 0) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| (1, 1, 2)        | 2           | 2             | 2     | 2      | (2, 1, 0) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| (4, 5, 6)        | 16/11       | 1.4545        | 3/2   | 1.5    | (2, 3, 0) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| <b>(3, 4, 5)</b> | <b>13/9</b> | <b>1.4444</b> | 3/2   | 1.5    | (1, 2, 0) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| (1, 1, 1)        | 3/2         | 1.5           | 3/2   | 1.5    | (1, 0, 3) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| (2, 3, 2)        | 7/4         | 1.75          | 7/4   | 1.75   | (2, 0, 3) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| (4, 6, 7)        | 17/11       | 1.5454        | 17/11 | 1.5454 | (1, 0, 2) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| (2, 3, 5)        | 5/3         | 1.6667        | 5/3   | 1.6667 | (1, 0, 1) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| (2, 3, 3)        | 8/5         | 1.6           | 8/5   | 1.6    | (1, 0, 0) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| (2, 3, 4)        | 3/2         | 1.5           | 3/2   | 1.5    | (0, 2, 1) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| (1, 2, 1)        | 2           | 2             | 2     | 2      | (0, 1, 1) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| (2, 4, 3)        | 9/5         | 1.8           | 9/5   | 1.8    | (0, 1, 2) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| (1, 2, 2)        | 5/3         | 1.6667        | 5/3   | 1.6667 | (0, 1, 0) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| (1, 2, 3)        | 2           | 2             | 2     | 2      | (0, 0, 1) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |

FIGURE 1. Rays for curve  $(t^3, t^4, t^5)$ 

- every row  $A_i$  with non-negative entries and
- every row  $A_i$  proportional to some other row  $A_j$ .

Every ray in  $\Gamma(1)$  is defined by  $n - 1$   $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear independent rows of the matrix  $A$ . The problem of enumerating all rays of a fan has been solved in [AF92], the authors proved that the full list of vertices can be found in  $O(r_A^2(n-1)N_0)$  time, where  $N_0$  is the number of rays and  $r_A$  is the number of rows of the matrix  $A$ . Note that  $r_A \leq n + \binom{2r}{2}$  and  $N_0 \leq \binom{r_A}{n-1}$ . In general the problem of estimating  $N_0$  is hard. Once we have obtained the list of all rays, then we shall evaluate the function  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}$  at every ray and compute the minimum.

**Example 5.2.** Let  $V \subset \mathbb{A}^3$  be the monomial curve given by the parametrization  $(t^3, t^4, t^5)$ . The ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$ , defining  $V$ , is generated by the binomials:

$$\langle x_2^2 - x_1x_3, x_2x_3 - x_1^3, x_3^2 - x_1^2x_2 \rangle.$$

In fact these three binomials form a standard basis of the ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$ . The triple  $(M^+, M^-, u)$  associated to these generators is

$$M^+ = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \quad M^- = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 3 & 0 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad u = (1, 1, 1).$$

The transpose of matrix  $A$ , after deleting superfluous rows, is

$$A^t = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & -2 & -3 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -2 & 0 & -1 & -2 & -1 & -2 & -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We obtain 30 rays and the minimum of  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}$  is  $\text{lct}(\mathfrak{a}) = 13/9$ . Figure 1 is the list of all the rays of  $\Gamma$ , each vector is the solution of the linear system obtained by choosing two rows of  $A$ . We also show the values of  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}$  and  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}^*$ .

| Ray              | lct        |             | lct*     |          | Ray       | lct |   | lct*     |          |
|------------------|------------|-------------|----------|----------|-----------|-----|---|----------|----------|
| (2, 5, 5)        | 4/3        | 1.3333      | 4/3      | 1.3333   | (2, 5, 0) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| (4, 10, 11)      | 25/19      | 1.3158      | 25/19    | 1.3158   | (1, 3, 0) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| (2, 6, 5)        | 13/9       | 1.4444      | 13/9     | 1.4444   | (1, 2, 0) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| (2, 4, 5)        | 11/8       | 1.375       | 11/8     | 1.375    | (1, 1, 0) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| (2, 5, 4)        | 11/8       | 1.375       | 11/8     | 1.375    | (1, 0, 5) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| (1, 3, 2)        | 3/2        | 1.5         | 3/2      | 1.5      | (2, 0, 5) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| (4, 9, 10)       | 24/19      | 1.2631      | 23/18    | 1.2778   | (2, 0, 3) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| (3, 7, 8)        | 19/15      | 1.2667      | 9/7      | 1.2857   | (1, 0, 2) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| <b>(1, 2, 2)</b> | <b>5/4</b> | <b>1.25</b> | 5/4      | 1.25     | (1, 0, 3) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| (1, 3, 3)        | 7/5        | 1.4         | 7/5      | 1.4      | (1, 0, 1) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| (2, 5, 6)        | 13/10      | 1.3         | 13/10    | 1.3      | (1, 0, 0) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| (2, 3, 5)        | 5/3        | 1.6667      | 5/3      | 1.6667   | (0, 2, 1) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| (2, 5, 7)        | 7/5        | 1.4         | 7/5      | 1.4      | (0, 1, 2) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| (1, 1, 2)        | 2          | 2           | 2        | 2        | (0, 1, 1) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| (1, 3, 4)        | 8/5        | 1.6         | 8/5      | 1.6      | (0, 1, 0) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| (1, 2, 3)        | 3/2        | 1.5         | 3/2      | 1.5      | (0, 0, 1) | 2   | 2 | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |
| (1, 5, 0)        | 2          | 2           | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |           |     |   |          |          |

FIGURE 2. Rays for curve  $t^3, t^7, t^8$ 

The ray giving the minimum coincides with the vector coming from the parametrization of the curve. However this is not always true as it is illustrated by the next example.

**Example 5.3.** Let  $V \subset \mathbb{A}^3$  be the monomial curve given by the parametrization  $(t^3, t^7, t^8)$ . The ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$  defining  $V$  is generated by binomials and the standard basis is:

$$\mathfrak{a} = \langle x_1^2 x_3 - x_2^2, x_1 x_2^3 - x_3^3, x_1^3 x_2 - x_2^2, x_2^5 - x_1 x_3^4, x_1^5 - x_2 x_3 \rangle.$$

For computations it is enough to consider a set of generators, say,

$$\mathfrak{a} = \langle x_1^2 x_3 - x_2^2, x_1^3 x_2 - x_3^2, x_1^5 - x_2 x_3 \rangle.$$

The triple  $(M^+, M^-, u)$  associated to these generators is

$$M^+ = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 & 1 \\ 3 & 1 & 0 \\ 5 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad M^- = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad u = (1, 1, 1).$$

The transpose of  $A$ , after deleting superfluous rows, is

$$A^t = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -3 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 5 & 5 & 5 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -2 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -2 & 0 & -1 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & -2 & -1 & -2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We obtain 33 rays and the minimum of  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}$  is  $\text{lct}(\mathfrak{a}) = 5/4$ . Figure 2 shows the list of all the rays. Note that the minimum is achieved at ray (1, 2, 2) and not at ray (3, 7, 8).

**Example 5.4.** Let  $V \subset \mathbb{A}^4$  be the monomial curve given by the parametrization  $(t^5, t^6, t^8, t^9)$ . The ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$  defining  $V$  is generated by six binomials

$$\mathfrak{a} = \langle x_2 x_3 - x_1 x_4, x_1^2 x_3 - x_4^2, x_2^3 - x_1^2 x_3, x_1 x_2^2 - x_3 x_4, x_1^2 x_2 - x_3^2, x_1^3 - x_2 x_4 \rangle.$$

The triple  $(M^+, M^-, u)$  is

$$M^+ = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad M^- = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \\ 2 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad u = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1).$$

The matrix  $A$ , after deleting superfluous rows, has 41 rows, we obtain a list of 848 rays. The minimum of  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}$  is  $23/12 = \text{lct}(W, \mathfrak{a})$  which is attained at the ray  $(4, 5, 6, 7)$ . The function  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}^*$  has minimum equal to 2, which corresponds to the log-canonical threshold of the monomial ideal

$$\langle x_2 x_3, x_1 x_4, x_1^2 x_3, x_2^2, x_1 x_2^2, x_3 x_4, x_1^2 x_2, x_3^2, x_1^3, x_2 x_4 \rangle.$$

**Example 5.5.** Let  $V \subset \mathbb{A}^4$  be the toric surface given by the parametrization

$$(t_1 t_2^3, t_1^2 t_2^2, t_1^3 t_2^2, t_1 t_2^7).$$

The ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$  defining  $V$  is generated by three binomials

$$\mathfrak{a} = \langle x_2 x_4 - x_1^3, x_3^4 x_4 - x_1 x_2^6, x_1^2 x_3^4 - x_2^7 \rangle.$$

The triple  $(M^+, M^-, u)$  is

$$M^+ = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 4 & 1 \\ 2 & 0 & 4 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad M^- = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 6 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 7 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad u = (1, 1, 1).$$

The matrix  $A$ , after deleting superfluous rows, has 19 rows and we obtain a list of 124 rays. The minimum of  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}$  is  $99/76 = \text{lct}(W, \mathfrak{a})$  which is attained at the ray  $(4, 12, 19, 0)$ . The function  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u)}^*$  has minimum equal to  $17/12$ , which corresponds to the log-canonical threshold of the monomial ideal

$$\langle x_2 x_4, x_1^3, x_3^4 x_4, x_1 x_2^6, x_1^2 x_3^4, x_2^7 \rangle.$$

**Example 5.6.** Set  $\mathfrak{a}_1$  the ideal in  $k[x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5]$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{a}_1 &= \langle x_2^2 x_4 - x_1 x_3 x_4, x_1^3 x_4 - x_3^2 x_4, x_2^2 x_5 - x_1 x_3 x_5, x_1^3 x_5 - x_3^2 x_5 \rangle = \\ &= \langle x_2^2 - x_1 x_3, x_1^3 - x_3^2 \rangle \langle x_4, x_5 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\langle x_2^2 - x_1 x_3, x_1^3 - x_3^2 \rangle$  is the ideal of the monomial curve  $(t^4, t^5, t^6)$  in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ .

Set  $\mathfrak{a}_2$  to be the ideal

$$\mathfrak{a}_2 = \langle x_2^2 x_4 - x_1 x_3 x_4, x_1^3 x_4 - x_3^2 x_4, x_2^2 x_5 + x_1 x_3 x_5, x_1^3 x_5 - x_3^2 x_5 \rangle.$$

Note that the triples associated to  $\mathfrak{a}_1$  and  $\mathfrak{a}_2$  are  $(M^+, M^-, u_1)$  and  $(M^+, M^-, u_2)$  respectively, where

$$M^+ = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad M^- = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{aligned} u_1 &= (1, 1, 1, 1), \\ u_2 &= (1, 1, -1, 1). \end{aligned}$$

The fan  $\Gamma$ , which is the same for both ideals, has 177 rays. The minimum of  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u_1)}$  is  $17/12$  which is attained at  $(4, 5, 6, 0, 0)$ . The minimum of  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u_1)}$  is  $3/2$  which is attained at  $(4, 5, 6, 0, 0)$ , it is also attained at  $(1, 1, 1, 0, 0)$  and at  $(2, 3, 4, 0, 0)$ .

The ideals  $\mathfrak{a}_1$  and  $\mathfrak{a}_2$  only differ in one coefficient and they have different log canonical threshold:

$$\text{lct}(W, \mathfrak{a}_1) = \frac{17}{12}, \quad \text{lct}(W, \mathfrak{a}_2) = \frac{3}{2}.$$

This is an example that illustrates that the log canonical threshold of a general binomial ideal depends not only on the exponents of the monomials, but also on the coefficients. Set  $v = (4, 5, 6, 0, 0)$ , we give the details of the computations of  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u_1)}(4, 5, 6, 0, 0)$  and  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u_1)}(4, 5, 6, 0, 0)$ . Note that  $\alpha = M^+v = M^-v = (10, 12, 10, 12)$ ,  $\beta = (M^+ - M^-)v = (0, 0, 0, 0)$ . The permutation  $\varepsilon$  is such that  $\varepsilon(1) = 1$ ,  $\varepsilon(2) = 3$ ,  $\varepsilon(3) = 2$ ,  $\varepsilon(4) = 4$ . The rank of  $M^+ - M^-$  is  $s = 2$ .

For the ideal  $\mathfrak{a}_1$ , we have

$$\mathfrak{a}_1 \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{T}} \neq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{T}}$$

and the sequence  $n_1 = 1$ ,  $n_2 = 3$ ,  $n_3 = 5$ . The value  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u_1)}(4, 5, 6, 0, 0)$  is the minimum of

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{s} &= s = 2, \\ \frac{|v|}{\alpha_1} &= \frac{15}{10}, \\ \frac{|v| + (\alpha_2 - \alpha_1)}{\alpha_2} &= \frac{17}{12}. \end{aligned}$$

For the ideal  $\mathfrak{a}_2$ , we have

$$\langle x_2^2 x_4 - x_1 x_3 x_4, x_2^2 x_5 + x_1 x_3 x_5 \rangle \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{T}} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{T}},$$

and the sequence  $n_1 = 1$ ,  $n_2 = 2$ . The value  $\text{lct}_{(M^+, M^-, u_2)}(4, 5, 6, 0, 0)$  is the minimum of

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{s} &= \infty, \\ \frac{|v|}{\alpha_1} &= \frac{15}{10}, \\ \frac{|v| + (\alpha_3 - \alpha_1)}{\alpha_3} &= \frac{15}{10}. \end{aligned}$$

**Example 5.7.** Example 5.6 may be generalized to the ideal

$$\mathfrak{a}_2 = \langle x_2^2 x_4 - u_1 x_1 x_3 x_4, x_1^3 x_4 - u_2 x_3^2 x_4, x_2^2 x_5 - u_3 x_1 x_3 x_5, x_1^3 x_5 - u_4 x_3^2 x_5 \rangle,$$

where  $u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4 \in k^*$ . In this case we have that

$$\text{lct}(\mathbb{A}^5, \mathfrak{a}_2) = \begin{cases} 3/2 & \text{if } u_1 \neq u_3 \\ 17/12 & \text{if } u_1 = u_3 \end{cases}$$

## REFERENCES

- [AF92] David Avis and Komei Fukuda. A pivoting algorithm for convex hulls and vertex enumeration of arrangements and polyhedra. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 8(3):295–313, 1992. ACM Symposium on Computational Geometry (North Conway, NH, 1991).
- [BEV05] Ana María Bravo, Santiago Encinas, and Orlando Villamayor. A simplified proof of desingularization and applications. *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana*, 21(2):349–458, 2005.
- [BL04] Manuel Blickle and Robert Lazarsfeld. An informal introduction to multiplier ideals. In *Trends in commutative algebra*, volume 51 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 87–114. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2004.
- [Bli04] Manuel Blickle. Multiplier ideals and modules on toric varieties. *Math. Z.*, 248(1):113–121, 2004.

- [CLS11] David A. Cox, John B. Little, and Henry K. Schenck. *Toric varieties*, volume 124 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2011.
- [DGPS12] Wolfram Decker, Gert-Martin Greuel, Gerhard Pfister, and Hans Schönemann. SINGULAR 3-1-6 — A computer algebra system for polynomial computations. <http://www.singular.uni-kl.de>, 2012.
- [ELSV04] Lawrence Ein, Robert Lazarsfeld, Karen E. Smith, and Dror Varolin. Jumping coefficients of multiplier ideals. *Duke Math. J.*, 123(3):469–506, 2004.
- [ES96] David Eisenbud and Bernd Sturmfels. Binomial ideals. *Duke Math. J.*, 84(1):1–45, 1996.
- [EV00] Santiago Encinas and Orlando Villamayor. A course on constructive desingularization and equivariance. In *Resolution of singularities (Obergrugl, 1997)*, volume 181 of *Progr. Math.*, pages 147–227. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2000.
- [Ful93] William Fulton. *Introduction to toric varieties*, volume 131 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993. The William H. Roever Lectures in Geometry.
- [Gow05] Russell A. Goward, Jr. A simple algorithm for principalization of monomial ideals. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 357(12):4805–4812 (electronic), 2005.
- [GPT02] Pedro Daniel González Pérez and Bernard Teissier. Embedded resolutions of non necessarily normal affine toric varieties. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 334(5):379–382, 2002.
- [GPT14] Pedro D. González Pérez and Bernard Teissier. Toric geometry and the Semple–Nash modification. *Rev. R. Acad. Cienc. Exactas Fís. Nat. Ser. A Math. RACSAM*, 108(1):1–48, 2014.
- [Hau03] Herwig Hauser. The Hironaka theorem on resolution of singularities (or: A proof we always wanted to understand). *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 40(3):323–403 (electronic), 2003.
- [How01] J. A. Howald. Multiplier ideals of monomial ideals. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 353(7):2665–2671 (electronic), 2001.
- [Laz04] Robert Lazarsfeld. *Positivity in algebraic geometry. II*, volume 49 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004. Positivity for vector bundles, and multiplier ideals.
- [Laz10] Robert Lazarsfeld. A short course on multiplier ideals. In *Analytic and algebraic geometry*, volume 17 of *IAS/Park City Math. Ser.*, pages 451–494. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2010.
- [Oda88] Tadao Oda. *Convex bodies and algebraic geometry*, volume 15 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1988. An introduction to the theory of toric varieties, Translated from the Japanese.
- [ST09] Takafumi Shibuta and Shunsuke Takagi. Log canonical thresholds of binomial ideals. *Manuscripta Math.*, 130(1):45–61, 2009.
- [Tei04] Bernard Teissier. Monomial ideals, binomial ideals, polynomial ideals. In *Trends in commutative algebra*, volume 51 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 211–246. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2004.
- [Tho14] Howard M. Thompson. Multiplier ideals of monomial space curves. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. Ser. B*, 1:33–41, 2014.
- [Zei06] Dominik Zeillinger. A short solution to Hironaka’s polyhedra game. *Enseign. Math. (2)*, 52(1-2):143–158, 2006.

DEPTO. MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD DE CASTILLA LA MANCHA. SPAIN.

*E-mail address:* MariaRocio.Blanco@uclm.es

DEPTO. MATEMÁTICA APLICADA AND IMUVA, INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICAS. UNIVERSIDAD DE VALLADOLID. SPAIN.

*E-mail address:* sencinas@maf.uva.es